

*gilt  
Label*

# The American Historical Review

## Board of Editors

CARL BECKER  
EDWARD P. CHEYNEY  
CHARLES H. HASKINS

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON  
JAMES H. ROBINSON  
CLAUDE H. VAN TYNE

## Managing Editor

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOL. XXV NO. 1

OCTOBER, 1919

## ISSUED QUARTERLY

## CONTENTS

ALBERT B. WHITE	Was there a "Common Council" before Parliament?	1
WITT BOWDEN	The English Manufacturers and the Commercial Treaty of 1786 with France	18
BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT	The Diplomatic Preliminaries of the Crimean War	36
NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS—	Notes on the Beginnings of Aeronautics in America; The Collection of State War Service Records	68
DOCUMENTS—	Letter of David Colden, Loyalist, 1783, contributed by E. Alfred Jones	79
REVIEWS OF BOOKS—	Plunket's <i>Isabel of Castile</i> ; Dobbs's <i>Education and Social Movements</i> ; Whitehouse's <i>Life of Lamartine</i> ; Robertson's <i>Bismarck</i> ; Whitlock's <i>Belgium</i> ; Hasenclever's <i>Geschichte Aegyptens im 19. Jahrhundert</i> ; Phillips's <i>American Negro Slavery</i> ; Stauffer's <i>New England and the Bavarian Illuminati</i> ; Cole's [Illinois in] <i>The Era of the Civil War</i> ; Viallate's <i>Les États-Unis d'Amérique et le Conflit Européen</i> .	87
(For a complete list of reviews see next page)		
HISTORICAL NEWS		145

## THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

41 NORTH QUEEN ST., LANCASTER, PA.

64-66 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK.

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Entered at the post-office, Lancaster, Pa., as second-class mail matter.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Davies, <i>The Baronial Opposition to Edward II.</i> , by Professor G. B. Adams . . . . .	87
Plunket, <i>Isabel of Castile</i> . . . . .	88
Smith and Jacobs, <i>Luther's Correspondence</i> , II., by Professor Martin Reu . . . . .	90
Twemlow, <i>Liverpool Town Books</i> , I., by Professor W. P. M. Kennedy . . . . .	92
Dobbs, <i>Education and Social Movements</i> , by Professor M. W. Jernegan . . . . .	93
Scott, <i>The Treaties of 1785, 1799, and 1828 between the United States and Prussia</i> , by Professor S. F. Bemis . . . . .	95
Scott, <i>The Armed Neutralities of 1780 and 1800</i> , by the same . . . . .	95
Laski, <i>Authority in the Modern State</i> , by Professor J. Q. Dealey . . . . .	97
Whitehouse, <i>Life of Lamartine</i> , by Professor C. D. Hazen . . . . .	99
Robertson, <i>Bismarck</i> , by Professor S. B. Fay . . . . .	101
Lindner, <i>Weltgeschichte</i> , IX., by Professor M. W. Tyler . . . . .	103
Cerf, <i>Alsace-Lorraine since 1870</i> . . . . .	105
Marriott, <i>The European Commonwealth</i> , by Professor A. I. Andrews . . . . .	106
Whitlock, <i>Belgium, a Personal Narrative</i> , by Professor D. C. Munro . . . . .	107
Wilton, <i>Russia's Agony</i> , by Professor F. A. Golder . . . . .	109
Ferrer, <i>Problems of Peace</i> , by Professor W. E. Lingelbach . . . . .	110

### BOOKS OF MODERN ORIENTAL HISTORY

Williams, <i>An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century</i> , by Professor E. W. Hopkins . . . . .	112
Hasenclever, <i>Geschichte Aegyptens im 19. Jahrhundert</i> , by Professor R. J. H. Gottheil . . . . .	114

### BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Phillips, <i>American Negro Slavery</i> , by T. D. Jervey . . . . .	117
McIlwaine, <i>Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia</i> , by Professor T. J. Wertenbaker . . . . .	118
Stauffer, <i>New England and the Bavarian Illuminati</i> , by Professor F. A. Christie . . . . .	120
Hamilton, <i>The Papers of Thomas Ruffin</i> , II., by Professor W. E. Dodd . . . . .	122
Cole, <i>The Era of the Civil War [Illinois]</i> , by Professor J. A. Woodburn . . . . .	123
Viallate, <i>Les États-Unis d'Amérique et le Conflit Européen</i> , by Professor G. F. Zook . . . . .	124
Hovelaque, <i>Les États-Unis et la Guerre</i> , by the same . . . . .	124
García, <i>Don Juan de Palafox</i> , by Professor H. E. Bolton . . . . .	126
Lecuna, <i>Papeles de Bolívar</i> , by Professor W. S. Robertson . . . . .	128
MINOR NOTICES . . . . .	130

*The American Historical Association supplies the REVIEW to all its members; the Executive Council of the Association elects members of the Board of Editors.*

*Correspondence in regard to contributions to the REVIEW may be sent to the Managing Editor, J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., or to the Board of Editors. Books for review may be sent to the Managing Editor. Subscriptions should be sent to The Macmillan Company, 41 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa., or 66 Fifth Ave., New York. The price of subscription, to persons who are not members of the American Historical Association, is four dollars a year; single numbers are sold for one dollar; bound volumes may be obtained for five dollars. Back numbers or volumes of the REVIEW may be obtained at the same rate.*

COPYRIGHT, 1919, BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

## The Audiencia in the Spanish Colonies

As Illustrated by the Audiencia of Manila (1583-1800)

University of California Publications in History, Vol. IX

By Charles Henry Cunningham, Ph.D.  
Adjunct Professor of History in the University of Texas

An extended investigation of the Audiencia, the central institution in the Spanish Colonial System. Based on original documents in the various depositories in Manila (the Philippine Library, the Philippine Archive), and the archives of Spain, particularly the Archive of the Indies at Seville.

A worthy number in the growing list of California's historical monographs.

475 pages, cloth, \$4.00; carriage extra

University of California Press  
Berkeley, Cal. 280 Madison Ave., N. Y.

## Luther's Correspondence and other Contemporary Letters

Translated and Edited by  
Preserved Smith, Ph.D., and  
Charles M. Jacobs, D.D.

Volume II is now ready, and you can not afford to be without it—Luther's own letters and those of his friends and enemies. Vol. II contains two letters hitherto unpublished.

Vol. I carries us through Luther's early struggles; Vol. II from the Diet of Worms to the Diet of Spire; Vol. III in preparation.

They are scholarly works, of unlimited value as reference books, reading books and real history. They are well indexed and fully annotated.

Cloth bound. \$3.50 a volume. Vols. I and II, \$6.00.

The United  
Lutheran Publication House  
Ninth and Sansom Sts. Philadelphia  
Chicago Pittsburgh New York

### A New College Text

## An Introduction to the Industrial History of England

By ABBOTT PAYSON USHER, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Economics, Cornell University

\$2.50 Postpaid

CONTENTS: FORMS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION. THE RISE OF CRAFTS IN ANTIQUITY. CRAFTS AND CRAFT GILDS IN MEDIAEVAL FRANCE. THE POPULATION OF ENGLAND: 1086-1700. VILLAGE AND MANOR. THE TRADERS AND THE TOWNS. THE DEVELOPMENT OF GILDS IN ENGLAND. THE WOOLEN INDUSTRIES: 1450-1750. THE ENCLOSURE MOVEMENT AND LAND REFORM. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION. THE EAST INDIA COMPANY AND THE VESTED INTERESTS. THE NEW COTTON INDUSTRY. THE REORGANIZATION OF THE METAL TRADES. THE RISE OF THE MODERN FACTORY SYSTEM. THE RISE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING. THE PROTECTION OF HEALTH AND WELFARE BY THE STATE. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE RAILWAY. THE GOVERNMENT AND THE RAILWAYS. COMBINATIONS AND MONOPOLIES. INCOMES, WAGES, AND SOCIAL UNREST.

Houghton Mifflin Company

Boston

New York

Chicago



## Books of Historical Interest and on Allied Subjects

### The Turn of the Tide

By Lieut.-Col. JENNINGS C. WISE, U.S.A.

Fresh from France and the Historical Section of the General Staff at Chaumont, Colonel Wise is the first writer to return to this country fully equipped to discuss with authority our share in the war. Not only is his narrative the clear and gripping one of a man already used to handling the pen successfully on military topics, but, enjoying an enviable reputation as a Battalion Commander in the great battle of the Meuse-Argonne, he writes of war out of a fund of intimate knowledge. \$3.00

### Army Physical Training

By Col. WM. H. WALDRON, U.S.A.

The exercises contained in this book, the result of many years of study and experience, form the basis upon which the entire system of Physical Training in the United States Army is founded. It should make the "tired-business-man" type extinct. \$1.50

### Army Mental Tests

By CLARENCE S. YOAKUM and  
ROBERT M. YERKES

A government authorized account of the mental examinations made at the great training camps during the war. In peace times it should aid in selecting business employees. \$1.50

### Fifty Years of Europe (1870-1919)

By CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN

"A masterly study of a period that, in importance, is without a rival in the annals of modern Europe. . . . will bear reading and re-reading . . . it informs and interests, it will have the effect of inducing even the least serious of its readers to think."—*N. Y. Times*.

Maps. \$2.50

### The Problem of the Pacific

By C. BRUNSDON FLETCHER

"The only way to make the Pacific safe," says Sir Wm. Macgregor in his preface, "is to keep political Germany out of it."

With folding map. \$3.00

### The Dardanelles Campaign

By H. W. DEVINSON

"Well ordered, well arranged, well balanced, . . . eloquent and austere, careful and wise. It is not likely that any other book will supersede it."—JOHN MASEFIELD, in the *Manchester Guardian*.

\$5.00

**Henry Holt & Company**

19 West 44th Street  
NEW YORK CITY



## CIVILIZATION AND THE WORLD WAR

By ANSON DANIEL MORSE, Lake Winkley  
Professor of History in Amherst College

A unique study of civilization from its dawn through February 28, 1916, the last record of the author. It is the result of a lifetime of study, thought, and teaching. *Just published.*

## *Selections and Documents in Economics*

### *Immigration and Americanization*

#### **Selected Readings**

Compiled by PHILIP DAVIS, *Boston University*, assisted by Bertha Schwartz

A bird's-eye view of the literature on immigration and Americanization from the earliest phases of colonization to the latest utterances called forth by the World War. *Just published.*

### *Trusts, Pools, and Corporations, (Revised Edition)*

By WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY, *Harvard University*

### *Trade Unionism and Labor Problems*

By JOHN R. COMMONS, *University of Wisconsin*

### *Sociology and Social Progress*

By THOMAS N. CARVER, *Harvard University*

### *Selected Readings in Public Finance*

By CHARLES J. BULLOCK, *Harvard University*

### *Railway Problems (Revised Edition)*

By WILLIAM Z. RIPLEY, *Harvard University*

### *Selected Readings in Economics*

By CHARLES J. BULLOCK, *Harvard University*

### *Economic History of the United States. 1765-1860*

By GUY STEVENS CALLENDER, late of *Yale University*

### *Selected Readings in Rural Economics*

By THOMAS N. CARVER, *Harvard University*

### *Readings in Social Problems*

By ALBERT BENEDICT WOLFE, *University of Texas*

## GINN AND COMPANY

BOSTON  
NEW YORK  
CHICAGO  
LONDON



ATLANTA  
DALLAS  
COLUMBUS  
SAN FRANCISCO

## Significant Scribner Books—Summer 1919

**Addresses in America: 1919.** By John Galsworthy \$1.25

An inspiring appeal to American idealism and leadership in the present crisis.

**The Powers and Aims of Western Democracy.**

By William M. Sloane \$3.50

A discussion of the nature of Democracy, of Nationality, and the chances of peace under the democratic system.

**The Remaking of a Mind.** By Henry De Man \$1.75

A brilliant study of some of the problems of reconstruction by a leader of the Belgian Labor Party.

**My Italian Year** By Joseph Collins *Illus.* \$2.50

Observations on Italian life and temperament under war conditions by a long-time lover of Italy.

**The Soul of the C. R. B.** By Madame M. Saint Renè

Taillandier \$1.75

A delightful account of the Hoover relief work as the French saw it by a talented Frenchwoman.

**War in the Garden of Eden.** By Kermit Roosevelt *Illus.* \$1.60

A graphic record of the campaigns in the Near East.

**The Principles of Playmaking and other Discus-**

**sions o the Drama.** By Brander Matthews \$1.60

A dozen papers on various phases of the drama, past and present.

**Plays by Jacinto Benavente** (*Second Series*) \$2.00

Four Spanish plays distinguished for their scintillating dialogue and their Molièresque satire.

**The Roosevelt Adventure Books.** 7 vols. \$2.50; Set \$15.00

A uniform edition of: African Game Trails (two volumes); Through the Brazilian Wilderness; Outdoor Pastimes of an American Hunter; A Book-Lover's Holidays in the Open; and the Rough Riders.

**Saint's Progress.** By John Galsworthy \$1.60

"One stands wordless and overcome in the presence of a great novel."—Atlantic Monthly.

**Miss Fingal.** By Mrs. W. K. Clifford \$1.50

A psychic novel. "One the best novels of the last few years," says Wm. Lyon Phelps.

**Joy in the Morning.** By Mary Raymond Shipman Andrews \$1.60

Stories of the present war recalling the lofty patriotism of Mrs. Andrews' "Perfect Tribute".

**Mr. Dooley on making a Will and Other Necessary Evils.**

\$1.35

A new Dooley book—the first since 1910.

**Old New England Doorways.** By Albert G. Robinson \$3.00

A book for anyone with a drop of the collector's blood in his veins.

### CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Fifth Avenue at 48th Street,

NEW YORK

The  
**American Historical Review**

WAS THERE A "COMMON COUNCIL" BEFORE  
PARLIAMENT?

IT has been more or less generally supposed that the assembly which came to be called Parliament was at some earlier time called the "Common Council"—that would be some time between the Conquest and, say, the middle of the thirteenth century, when Parliament was rapidly becoming the usual name. No doubt most who have been teaching the history of this period with any care or engaged in research upon it have become suspicious of this term and disinclined to use it. But there it stands in most of the best books to trouble us with doubts. It is not a harmless term. It may play a trick upon any unwary reader and even the cautious writer may corrupt himself with his own phrases. To English minds "Common Council" (as it is often translated and capitalized) is bound to suggest things national or representative or related to the middle classes, or all of these. If there is no ground in the phraseology of the time for such suggestion we should know it.<sup>1</sup> Not enough study has been given to matters of language in connection with the origin of Parliament; words and phrases have been taken for granted and traditions respecting these have been passed on from generation to generation of students, and no one has stopped to put them to the test of the sources and find out securely what they originally meant. In this time of gleaning after the great workers and the great discoveries in English constitutional history it has seemed worth while to devote one bit of investigation directly to this phrase.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is not in the least the object of the present paper to discuss whether or not the central assembly might have been appropriately called a common council at that time—if indeed there is anything to discuss along this line. The concern here is to know whether it was so called.

<sup>2</sup> When this investigation was nearly completed, my attention was called by Professor G. B. Adams to a statement by Mr. Robert Steele in *A Bibliography of Royal Proclamations of the Tudor and Stuart Sovereigns* (*Bibliotheca Lin-*



For it has been just these great workers who have continued the tradition respecting the "common council" and given that tradition authority. The Lords' Committees who drew up the *Reports on the Dignity of a Peer*, Thomas Duffus Hardy, Hallam, Stubbs, Pike, Bémont, Maitland, Liebermann, are examples; and the text-books of Taswell-Langmead and Medley. It is not necessary to extend the list or cite instances; all students of English history know the fact. And the myth is not dying out. Some very recent works even emphasize the phrase in this sense. Pasquet not only uses it frequently but takes pains to state that *magnum concilium* and *commune concilium* (spelling the latter word with a *c*) superseded *curia* and *concilium*.<sup>3</sup> And Dr. McKechnie, in the second edition no less than in the first edition of his great work on Magna Carta, makes it his regular appellation for the larger central assembly. Some of his pages bristle with it, and he states in several places that this was the assembly which became Parliament. Thus, when speaking of the omission of the twelfth and fourteenth articles in the 1217 edition of Magna Carta, he says: "All mention of the *Commune Concilium*—that predecessor of the modern Parliament, that germ of all that has made England famous in the realm of constitutional

*desiana*, vol. V.), I. li-lit. "A phrase familiar to modern students is liable to much misconception—the 'commune concilium [*sic*] regni'. It is important in such matters to adhere to the language of authentic records, which have, at any rate until their forms have become mere conventions, a real meaning. The difference between 'concilium' and 'consilium' does not exist in our records until comparatively late, and the term 'commune consilium regni', while it is often applied to the advice offered by a meeting, large or small, of magnates, unquestionably on some occasions means nothing more than what we should call public opinion. No assembly calling itself or called 'commune concilium regni' has left any trace upon the records, though many have given the 'commune consilium regni' to the King who summoned them. The former use of the term seems entirely due to the mistakes of the Stuart parliamentary antiquarians." While I can not at all agree with Mr. Steele about the lack of an early distinction between *concilium* and *consilium*, he has surely stated an important truth about *commune consilium* (though showing an unnecessary anxiety to connect *regni* with the phrase). But he could not in this place offer any proof of his statement, even supposing it had ever been a matter of enough interest with him to make the necessary collection of references. For that reason or because of its rather obscure and incidental appearance, it has passed unnoticed, at least unheeded. It is perhaps fair to add that I had adopted the large and small assembly sources of *commune consilium* and the "public opinion" idea and phrase as part of my classification and had so used them in a paper read publicly on the subject before I knew of Mr. Steele's statement. His suggestion that the "common council" tradition goes back for its source to the Stuart parliamentary antiquarians is interesting. I have made no attempt to trace it back of the nineteenth century.

<sup>3</sup> D. Pasquet, *Essai sur les Origines de la Chambre des Communes* (Paris, 1914), p. 3.

laws and liberties—disappears."<sup>4</sup> Sometimes, as here, he adopts the name untranslated, always, however, taking the liberty to change *s* to *c* in the second word; sometimes he calls it the "Common Council"; and he summarizes his notions of the term by saying that "The same Latin words which signify joint 'consent' or counsel thus came to signify also . . . that 'Common Council' afterwards of such vital constitutional importance, continuing under a new name the old *curia regis* . . . and passing in turn into the modern Parliament."<sup>5</sup>

In the course of the investigation the results of which are here submitted, much of the matter in print which was written in England between the Conquest and the middle of the thirteenth century has been examined.<sup>6</sup> No claim of exhaustive search is made, yet it is believed that the process has been carried far enough so that any new instances found will not be likely to upset the conclusions, supposing these to have been correctly drawn from the evidence already in hand.<sup>7</sup> Two hundred and fifty-eight independent<sup>8</sup> instances of the use of *commune consilium* have been found in this period, and these have been transcribed with accompanying text. Besides these

<sup>4</sup> W. S. McKechnie, *Magna Carta* (Glasgow, 1914), p. 149.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 249. The term *curia regis* is another about which much has been assumed and a good deal of myth and tradition gathered. It also should be studied.

<sup>6</sup> Yet it would have been hard and in some cases inadvisable to hold strictly to these boundaries, and it will be observed that they have sometimes been passed rather freely both as to time and place. While it is hoped that a fair degree of care has been used in going through the material, there can be no doubt that some instances have escaped notice. Besides the material indicated in the references, the following have been examined without revealing any instances of the phrase in question. Hence the references and this list (under the time-limits indicated) constitute the bibliography of this paper: William of Malmesbury; *Gesta Herwardi*; Eadmer, *Life of Anselm* and *Miracles of Anselm*; William of Poitiers; *Brevis Relatio*; Guy of Amiens; William of Jumièges; Simeon of Durham; John of Hexham; Aelred of Rievaulx; *Ann. S. Edmundi*; Henry of Huntingdon; Gervase of Canterbury; Robert de Monte; Richard of Devizes; Étienne de Rouen; Champollion-Figeac, *Lettres de Rois, Reines, et Autres Personnages des Cours de France et d'Angleterre*. Various other sources, promising little of value for the present purpose, such as Domesday Book, Pipe Rolls, *Publications* of the Selden Society, etc., have been more or less fully examined—some of them very carefully.

<sup>7</sup> The writer is wholly aware, however, that whatever value this paper has lies, not in the conclusions, but in assembling the references and drawing the attention of specialists in this field to an undoubtedly questionable tradition.

<sup>8</sup> Cases in which one chronicler copies the identical language of another are, of course, counted but once. But there are not a few in which, while there has been evident borrowing of ideas or fact, the form of statement was independent, and these are properly independent instances for the present purpose.

there have been collected, out of numberless examples, some two hundred cases of words or phrases similar to or in some way illustrating the phrase under discussion, such as "common assent", "common consent", "common choice", "common discussion", "common sentence" or "judgment", "common decree", "common consideration", "common estimate", and the like. These latter cannot, of course, be examined within the limits and purposes of this paper. And yet they constitute a fashion or trick of phraseology of the time which helps one to sense the contemporary force and meaning of the phrase in question. Some of them come very close to frequent meanings of "common counsel", and often there are combinations of the phrases (illustrations of this may be found among those given below), made apparently in order to bring clearness or emphasis. *Commune consilium*, in its standard uses, clearly belongs to a large family of serviceable phrases.

Several different shades of meaning and usage of *commune consilium* begin to stand out before the work of collection has gone far, and a possible classification suggests itself when a large number of contexts is studied together. A five-fold classification has appeared convenient for presentation here. Others might serve as well, and, under any scheme, some of the cases would be very hard to classify; no two people would do it in the same way. One point—the spelling of the second word—applies equally to all these uses, and should be mentioned before they are taken up individually. Writers have felt free to change *commune consilium* to *commune concilium* (also to capitalize the words either untranslated or translated); the latter form looks better in connection with their interpretation of it as an assembly name, and they have taken this liberty evidently upon the assumption that *consilium* and *concilium* were interchangeable in the Latin of the time. This brings up a rather important linguistic point which cannot be dealt with here. Suffice it to say that after noting thousands of instances—too many to make it ever feasible to prove the point by a list of references—the writer is convinced that there was at least as much distinction between these words in the writings in England during the two centuries following the Conquest as there was in classical Latin. *Concilium* was always the name of an assembly; *consilium* regularly meant counsel; exceptionally it denoted an assembly.<sup>9</sup> But, leaving this assertion un-

<sup>9</sup> It is my belief, however, that from early in the thirteenth century *consilium*, while retaining its standard meaning of advice or counsel, came also to be the regular name of the king's smaller, perpetual council, that which later became the Privy Council. See *American Historical Review*, XIX. 740-741, 868; XX. 330-333. I intend at some time to furnish further evidence of this.



proved, it is necessary and significant to notice here that in the two hundred and fifty-eight cases of *commune consilium* now to be considered the spelling is uniform—always *commune consilium*, never *commune concilium*.

Undoubtedly the most common sense of *commune consilium* is that in which it approaches our phrase "public opinion", or general understanding, consent, or consultation, obtained in no definite or formal way. Often it is understood from the context that certain individuals, groups, or parties are referred to—as the general opinion or consent of a crusading group; indeed it is very often used in connection with a fighting group or expedition of some sort, also of groups of messengers or ambassadors. Sometimes, however, it is impossible to tell from whom it is supposed to come. Of course in some of these cases the common advice may have been obtained possibly in formal meetings of the groups; but no hint of this is in the text, and the writer in his choice of language appears to have been uninfluenced by such association of ideas. This use is stable. Instances have been found pretty evenly distributed through material written all the way from the late eleventh century to the twelve-fifties, where the search ends. Ninety-two are listed here<sup>10</sup> (including the illustrations which follow).

In the few illustrations that there is space to give of this or other uses, it is impossible to convey the full or correct impression,

<sup>10</sup> Something of the distribution is shown here and in the other classes of cases by grouping the references into three periods, 1066–1154, 1154–1216, 1216–1250 (or later); and within the groups the references are arranged chronologically as far as can be readily determined.

1066–1154: Matthew Paris, II. 55; Ordericus Vitalis (in Migne, *Patrologia*, CLXXXVIII. 678, 686, 710); Matth. Paris, II. 85, 118; Eadmer, *Historia Novorum*, p. 287; Ord. Vit., pp. 497, 944; Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon*, II. 115; *Gesta Stephani*, pp. 71, 81. 1154–1216: *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, III. 74, 91; V. 160, 304; Benedictus, I. 19; Walter of Coventry, I. 198; Diceto, I. 384, 387, 431; Bigelow, *Placita*, p. 235; Wendover, I. 156; Diceto, II. 63, 65; Matth. Paris, II. 341; Map, *De Nugis*, p. 30; *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, II. 161, 165; Walter of Coventry, I. 393; *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, III. 229; V. 315; VI. 432; Benedictus, II. 110; Rigord, I. 111; Diceto, II. 103; Hoveden, III. 36; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Opera*, III. 212; IV. 400; Hoveden, IV. 19, 54, 67; Coventry, II. 134; Coggeshall, pp. 149, 150; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 132 (*bis*); *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 133. 1216–1258: *Ann. Waverley*, p. 287; Coventry, II. 233; *Patent Rolls*, 1216–1225, pp. 22–23, 31, 54, 65, 141; *Letters of Henry III.*, I. 36, 73; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 475–476; *Ann. Dunst.*, p. 64; *Patent Rolls*, pp. 481–482; *Letters of Henry III.*, I. 232 (*ter*); *Patent Rolls*, pp. 497–498; *Ann. Dunst.*, p. 92; *Patent Rolls*, 1225–1232, pp. 25–26; Bracton, *Note Book*, II. 218; *Patent Rolls*, p. 397; Matth. Paris, III. 209 (*bis*); *Ann. Dunst.*, p. 142; Matth. Paris, III. 563–564; IV. 339, 341; *Ann. Burton*, pp. 258, 260; Newburgh, II. 522; *Letters of Henry III.*, II. 84; Matth. Paris, V. 360; *Ann. Burton*, p. 336; Matth. Paris, V. 519, 645; *Ann. Burton*, pp. 453, 465; Matth. Paris, V. 727.

as those who have ever done this kind of collecting will understand. A feeling of the inevitableness of certain conclusions grows only through intimate acquaintance with the long and monotonous list of contexts themselves. The very monotony tells its tale. On the first Crusade (1097): "Tandem innumeris hinc et inde interfectis, et maxime ex eis qui victualia quaerebant, deficientibus alimentis, dominus Boamundus et comes Flandrensis Robertus de communi consilio, ut pabula quaererent, exierunt."<sup>11</sup> A quarrel between the canons and citizens of Rouen (1192):

Eodem anno orta est gravis dissensio inter clericos, scilicet canonicos, Rothomagi et cives civitatis. Canonici namque murum novum fecerant circa coemeterium suum, et colligerant intus mercatores: et visum erat civibus quod hoc fiebat ad detrimentum civitatis: et petierunt ut canonici prosternerent opus illud, et nolebant. Unde factum est quod quadam die cives ex communi consilio irruerunt, et murum illum funditus subverterunt.<sup>12</sup>

Article 6 in the apocryphal "Willelmi Articuli Londoniis Retractati" (1210): "Statuimus [here follow regulations about watch and ward] prout vicecomites et aldermanni et prepositi et ceteri ballivi et ministri nostri melius per commune consilium ad utilitatem regni providebunt."<sup>13</sup> A letter of Robert Fitz-Walter to William of Albini in which he seems to be speaking for the baron's forces (1215): "Et ideo per commune consilium prolongavimus torneamentum quod captum fuit apud Stanford".<sup>14</sup> In the same conflict (1217): "Barones itaque cum, cimiteriis et ecclesiis omnibus more solito spoliatis per viam, ad castellum de Muntsorel pervenissent, et obsidionem dissolvissent, communi omnium consilio decretum est, ut versus Lincolniam properarent, ubi Gilebertus de Gant cum aliis baronibus supradictis diutina obsidionem egerant, sed inanem."<sup>15</sup> From a letter of Richard of Cornwall giving an account of his crusade (1241): "Infra quem terminum apud Acon, vigilia Sancti Dionisii, ut vobis alias significavimus, applicantes, de communi consilio, praedicto Nazer mox misimus inquirendum, si treugam cum dicto rege factam nobis posset tenere."<sup>16</sup> Agitation of the bishops against the archbishop's visitation (1250): "Et sigillis suis scripto communi appensis, bona fide ad invicem promiserunt, quod communi auxilio et consilio archiepiscopo resisterent."<sup>17</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Matth. Paris, II. 68.

<sup>12</sup> Benedictus, II. 250.

<sup>13</sup> Felix Liebermann, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, p. 490.

<sup>14</sup> Matth. Paris, II. 614.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, III. 17.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 140.

<sup>17</sup> *Ann. Dunst.*, p. 181.

A second set of contexts is that in which the term denotes the mutual advice, consent, or opinion of relatively small groups—groups which seem not to have constituted a summoned assembly and yet about which there is some definiteness of specification. That is, there is a clearer indication whence the common counsel came than in the preceding class. Perhaps the commonest illustration of this use lies in the many papal letters scattered through the English material. The pope does things by the common counsel of the cardinals. And the English writers regularly use the same expression when they refer to the papal acts. But there are many other examples. This use, like the preceding, remains quite stable throughout—no significant increase or decrease. Eighty-one instances have been collected.<sup>18</sup> The following may serve to illustrate. From a letter to Henry II. by his envoys sent to Rome on the Becket matter (1171):

Cum vero nos quatuor cum episcopis [two] quidem, qui plurimum exire [from Sienna] desiderabant, non potuissemus, in maxima animi angustia positi, ex communi consilio media nocte et latenter exivimus. . . . Sic a curia venientes sero redierunt [two of the envoys] ad dominum papam, ei de communi nostro consilio exponentes quod nobis fuerat a vestra majestate injunctum . . . quod ea die immutabiliter disposuerat dominus papa in vos nominatim, et in totam terram vestram cismarinam et transmarinam, de communi fratrum consilio, interdicti ferre sententiam, et eam quae in episcopos lata fuerat confirmare.<sup>19</sup>

A certain case is to be tried in the locality (1226): "Et mandatum est vicecomiti Devonie quod certis die et loco, quos ipse et Wil-

<sup>18</sup> 1066–1154: Bigelow, *Placita*, p. 66; Matth. Paris, II. 68; Eadmer, p. 219. 1154–1216: *Materials for the History of Becket*, IV. 58; V. 491; VI. 421; VII. 62, 371, 484, 500; Matth. Paris, II. 282–283; Thomas of Monmouth, *St. William*, pp. 23, 47, 110, 186; Diceto, I. 346, 368–369, 381; Matth. Paris, II. 292; Benedictus, I. 202, 208; Diceto, I. 425; Matth. Paris, II. 316; Hoveden, II. 269; Benedictus, I. 293; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Opera*, VII. 201; Diceto, II. 39–40; Benedictus, II. 19, 57; *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, I. 27, 33; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Opera*, V. 355; VI. 68; Diceto, II. 75; Benedictus, II. 216; *Placita*, pp. 262, 282; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Opera*, III. 282; Hoveden, III. 275; Walter of Coventry, II. 80; Matth. Paris, II. 411; Diceto, II. 127; Hoveden, III. 292; Diceto, II. 141; Walter of Coventry, II. 107, 125; *Rotuli Chart.*, pp. 38, 45–46 (*ter*—in five letters following this in the rolls there are fifteen uses of the term which are little more than formal repetitions in duplicate letters sent to other places); Coggeshall, p. 133; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 64; Matth. Paris, II. 496 (*bis*); Stubbs, *Select Charters* (ninth ed.), pp. 279–280; Matth. Paris, II. 619; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 184, 187, 188, 269; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 126; *Ann. Waverley*, p. 283. 1216–1255: *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 190; *Letters of Henry III.*, I. 69; Bracton, *Note Book*, II. 139–140; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 532; Coventry, II. 274; *Close Rolls*, 1227–1231, p. 98; *Patent Rolls*, 1225–1232, p. 339, 362; *Letters of Henry III.*, II. 11; Matth. Paris, VI. 69, 144, 145; *Ann. Burton*, p. 339.

<sup>19</sup> *Mat. for the Hist. of Becket*, VII. 471–473.



lelmus de Raleg et Hugo Peverel de communi consilio providebunt, convenient et diligenter et plene".<sup>20</sup> Certain men have been sent to Rome on the king's business, and now he is sending others to them with added instructions (1231): "Volumus etiam et mandamus quod in omnibus negociis nostris vobis et ipsis injunctis, ipsi vobis et vos eis fideliter assistatis, eadem vobis adinvicem communicantes, et de communi consilio inde disponentes."<sup>21</sup> In a charter of the abbot of St. Albans (1258): "Deum habentes prae oculis, de communi fratrum nostrorum voluntate, consilio, et conniventia, subscriptas portiones duximus assignandas".<sup>22</sup>

Thirdly, there have been collected fifty-three instances in which the common counsel came from a gathering apparently of considerable size and usually summoned for a definite purpose.<sup>23</sup> Here is a critical point in the investigation, for the summoned assembly whose common counsel is oftenest mentioned is just that great council—*concilium*, *magnum concilium*, *colloquium* it was surely called—soon to be called *parliamentum*. Was it called the "common council"? Was it in a fair way to be so called when "parliament" began to usurp the place of earlier names? The following cases seem typical of this third set of contexts, which it has seemed best to illustrate somewhat more fully. The distribution does not differ much from that of the preceding classes. From a speech of the archbishop in an ecclesiastical council of the province of Canterbury (1175): "Ideo in ecclesia Dei, secundum antiquam patrum consuetudinem concilia congregantur, ut ii qui constituti sunt in eminentiori cura pastoralis, vitam subditorum de communi consilio regularibus institutis informet, et enormitates quae pullulant incessanter consultiore censura compescant."<sup>24</sup> A central assembly

<sup>20</sup> *Patent Rolls*, 1225-1232, p. 73.

<sup>21</sup> *Close Rolls*, 1227-1231, p. 582.

<sup>22</sup> *Matth. Paris*, V. 669.

<sup>23</sup> 1066-1154: *Eadmer*, p. 55; *Select Charters*, p. 117; *Eadmer*, pp. 148, 239, 291; *Florence of Worcester*, II. 70, 100. 1154-1216: *Mat. for the Hist. of Becket*, IV. 321, 327; VII. 56-57; *Hoveden*, II. 190, 239; *Benedictus*, I. 311; *Itinerarium Peregrinorum*, IV. 283; *Giraldus Cambrensis, Opera*, IV. 430; *Coggeshall*, pp. 102, 123; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, pp. 41, 52; *Matth. Paris*, II. 557; *Rot. Chart.*, p. 202. 1216-1259: *Patent Rolls*, 1216-1225, p. 125; *Letiers of Henry III.*, I. 58; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 437; *Patent Rolls*, 1216-1225, p. 463; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, II. 207; *Close Rolls*, 1227-1231, pp. 380-383 (the phrase is repeated in three duplicate letters following); *Patent Rolls*, 1225-1232, p. 463; *Rymer, Foedera*, I. 209; *Close Rolls*, 1231-1234, pp. 317, 318; *Letters of Henry III.*, I. 451; *Close Rolls*, 1234-1237, pp. 399, 501; *Ann. Dunst.*, pp. 168, 169; *Matth. Paris*, VI. 124-125; V. 81, 343, 732; *Bracton, De Legibus*, II. 44-45.

<sup>24</sup> *Benedictus*, I. 84.

arranges for an *iter* (1179): "Tunc rex congregatis episcopis et comitibus et proceribus regni apud Windesovers, communi eorum consilio,<sup>25</sup> coram rege filio suo, divisit in quatuor partes Angliam; et unicuique parti praecepit viros sapientes de regno; et postea misit eos per partes regni eis assignatas, ut iustitiam exercerent in populo."<sup>26</sup> An episode of the year 1201:

Statim post Pascha praecepit rex, ut comites et barones Angliae essent apud Portesmue ad Pentecosten, parati equis et armis ad transfretandum cum illo. . . . Interim comites Angliae convenerunt ad colloquium inter eos habitum apud Leicestre, et ex communi consilio mandaverunt regi quod non transfretarent cum illo, nisi ille reddiderit eis iura sua.<sup>27</sup>

From the writs announcing a tax (1207): "Sciatis quod per commune consilium et assensum concilii nostri apud Oxoniam, provisum est ad defensionem regni nostri et recuperationem juris nostri".<sup>28</sup> Wendover's summary of discussions at Rome between the ambassadors of Louis and the pope about the deposition of John (1216): "Item dicit Papa, quod de communi consilio generalis concilii [Fourth Lateran, 1215] excommunicaverat barones Angliae et omnes fautores eorum".<sup>29</sup> Beginning of a letter from King Henry to the Bishop of Durham (1225): "Rex Dunholm' Episcopo etc. salutem. Cum satis recolat discrecio vestra qualiter de communi consilio et spontanea voluntate Archiepiscoporum, Episcoporum, Comitum, et Baronum nostrorum quos generaliter ad presenciam nostram vocavimus concessa fuit nobis quintadecima rerum mobilium regni nostri".<sup>30</sup> From a similar letter (1233): "Rex abbati de Coggeshal' salutem. Satis vobis constat et bene recolitis qualiter de communi consilio et unanimi assensu omnium magnatum de regno nostro, tam episcoporum quam comitum, baronum, abbatum et priorum, concessum fuit nobis ab ipsis auxilium".<sup>31</sup> Concerning the assembly at Merton which enacted the so-called statute of that name (1236):

Rex Archiepiscopis Episcopis Abbatibus Prioribus Comitibus Baronibus Militibus et omnibus libere tenentibus in Hibernia constitutis Salutem. Sciatis quod in presentia venerabilis patris E. Cant' Archiepiscopi Episcoporum Abbatum Comitum et Baronum de Regno *nostro*

<sup>25</sup> By a misprint this word appears *concilio* in the *Rolls Series* edition; but an examination of the manuscript has shown the regular spelling.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 238.

<sup>27</sup> Hoveden, IV. 160-161.

<sup>28</sup> *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, I. 72.

<sup>29</sup> Matth. Paris, II. 662.

<sup>30</sup> *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, II. 75.

<sup>31</sup> *Close Rolls*, 1231-1234, p. 311.

Anglie et de communi consilio eorundem magnatum nuper provisum fuit quod. . . .<sup>32</sup>

From Matthew Paris's well-known account of the 1244 council which attempted to appoint ministers (throughout, it furnishes interesting illustrations of the meanings of *concilium* and *consilium*):

Et cum per commune consilium, a quo noluerunt recedere, provisum esset, ut responsio ad literas Papales pro rege deprecatorias prorogaretur usque ad terminum praenotatum, et recedentibus magnatibus, ultimo die concilii, quod sex diebus duraverat, usque ad noctem sollicitavit singulos praelatos, deprecans ut in crastino iterum convenirent. . . . [Grosseteste says:] Non dividamur a consilio communi. Quia scriptum est; Si dividamur, statim omnes moriemur. . . . Et murmurante et rege, solum est concilium. [Provisions of the council:] . . . de communi assensu quatuor eligantur potentes et nobiles de discretioribus totius regni, qui sint de consilio<sup>33</sup> domini regis . . .<sup>34</sup>

From the record of the year 1247: "De parlamento habito Londoniis . . . Tandem de communi consilio provisum est, ut gravamina terrae domino Papae seriatim monstraturi ad curiam Romanam nuntii discreti destinarentur".<sup>35</sup> From a letter of Innocent IV., written in 1252, to the bishops of the province of Canterbury about the exemption of parish churches from procurations. They are to be thus exempt, he says, unless by chance (*nisi forte*) the metropolitan, or someone acting on his authority, should decide that the visitation ought to be made—"ad singulorum vestrum petitionem, vel de communi majoris partis concilii consilio et assensu".<sup>36</sup> Provisions made respecting suit in baronial courts, etc. (1259): "Convenientibus apud Westmonasterium in Quindena S. Michaelis ipso domino rege et magnatibus suis, de communi consilio et consensu dictorum regis et magnatum, factae sunt provisiones subscriptae."<sup>37</sup> If there is anything to be detected in these illustrations, or indeed in the preceding uses, of what Maitland called the "slow and subtle process of personification", it is the personification of an abstraction, such as the result, action, or spirit of a council rather than the council itself. Common action, common deliberation, common consent, common advice—all at one time or another expressed by *commune consilium*—constituted an increasingly popular notion or ideal which was

<sup>32</sup> *Statutes of the Realm*, I. 4. The text as there printed indicates erasure of *nostro* in the manuscript.

<sup>33</sup> That is, of the king's small, continuous council.

<sup>34</sup> Matth. Paris, IV. 365-367, *passim*.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 594.

<sup>36</sup> *Ann. Burton*, p. 302. Probably the *concilium* indicates the synod of the province of Canterbury.

<sup>37</sup> *Letters of Henry III.*, II. 394.



being handed about in language. In fact, much might be said about the rise of the "common" or "community" idea in the middle of Henry III.'s reign.<sup>38</sup> During the twelve-forties especially, writings, both chronicle and official, were becoming suddenly filled with every possible use and combination of *communis* and *communitas*, and the ideas these words carried were ideas to conjure with in those days.<sup>39</sup>

The next group of cases, the fourth, is little more than a variation of the preceding. It is where the term is followed by the word *regni* (sometimes alone, sometimes in combination with other words)—*commune consilium regni*. These have been separated (thirty-two are listed here)<sup>40</sup> because the phrase has become so well known through the famous articles XII. and XIV. of Magna Carta, and because writers have been especially inclined to see an assembly name in this combination; it is familiar to us as the "Common Council of the Realm". It is significant, however, that Maitland and McKechnie—both convinced that at some time the larger central assembly was called the Common Council or the Common Council of the Realm—nevertheless translate the two notable instances of the phrase in Magna Carta as "common counsel". When they studied a particular text with care the notion of an assembly-name

<sup>38</sup> One is tempted to speculate on whether or not common counsel were a kind of predecessor of the majority idea. To-day, when a group, committee, or assembly speaks in a formal way it usually means the majority. But the majority opinion may or may not be a *resultant*. Were those who had charge of assemblies in the thirteenth century trying to get the "sense of the meeting", as we sometimes say?

<sup>39</sup> No doubt here and in the other groups there is an occasional case, where the context is scanty, which anyone who was convinced in advance that there was a common council, and so called, would so interpret, and which might puzzle an unprejudiced reader who should study that isolated text. And, of course, the Latin of this time was no dead language, used with stereotyped precision; there were constantly varying shades of meaning and many individual vagaries. But to any one who has got the language-atmosphere of the time and who may venture to supply the unexpressed but determinative notions of the occasional scanty context, there can be no doubt about the *regular* meaning of this phrase, a rule proved by remarkably few exceptions. In view of this the burden of proof is always on the conciliar idea in the doubtful cases.

<sup>40</sup> 1191-1215: Giraldus Cambrensis, *Opera*, V. 186; Hoveden, III. 155 (an examination of the manuscript has shown a printer's error in the *Rolls Series* text in making the second word *concilium*), 236-237; *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 54; Liebermann, *Gesetze*, p. 490; *Select Charters*, pp. 288, 294, 295. 1216-1255: *Foedera*, I. 140; *Patent Rolls*, 1216-1225, pp. 54, 71; *Select Charters*, p. 344; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 336, 371, 349; *Patent Rolls*, 1216-1225, pp. 153, 177 (*bis*); Walter of Coventry, II. 252; Matth. Paris, III. 126; *Select Charters*, pp. 324-325; *Close Rolls*, 1231-1234, p. 551; Matth. Paris, III. 362; VI. 65, 66, 68; *Letters of Henry III.*, II. 37; *Reports on the Dignity of a Peer*, III. 9 (followed by two writs on the same subject containing the same words); Matth. Paris, V. 7; *Flores Historiarum*, II. 346; Matth. Paris, V. 494 (*bis*).

vanished. But the convincing procedure here, as in the other cases, is to bring the contexts together. Then it appears that *commune consilium* with the *regni* added is still a descriptive phrase for an abstract notion, appearing in various verbal settings and combinations. And it may be stated here that in the uses thus far considered (including the present) *commune consilium* has been found but once in the nominative—then the subject of an intransitive verb and obviously bearing the meaning of common plan or counsel.<sup>41</sup> There have been 214 ablatives (121 after *de*, eighty-one without preposition, twelve after *ex*), forty accusatives (thirty-seven of them after *per*), and three genitives. Very little trace is to be found of what Liebermann has called “the operating subject of an action”. Just the phrase *commune consilium regni*, without further modifying words, has been found twelve times; eleven times, *commune consilium regni nostri* (all but two of these twenty-three after *per* or *de*—*per* appearing more frequently here); three times, *commune consilium totius regni*; and the following once each: *commune consilium totius regni nostri*, *commune consilium regni nostri Angliae*, *commune consilium totius regni nostri predicti*, *commune regni consilium et approbatio*, *commune regni convocati consilium et deliberatio*, *commune consilium domini legati et regni nostri*, *commune consilium omnium fidelium nostrorum regni nostri Angliae*. In one instance the phrase is paralleled with *communis assensus regni*. Indeed this latter may appear independently: action is taken *per communem assensum regni et civitatis* (London).<sup>42</sup> An examination of these various phrases and contexts shows that *commune consilium* with the *regni* added was not becoming a name of the great council or of any other body. But it should be noticed that this use is not evenly distributed, like the preceding. Beginning just at the end of the twelfth century and growing rapidly in the early thirteenth, it signified something new in the content and manner of

<sup>41</sup> It has just been discovered that the archbishop has escaped to the Continent (1164). The Northampton council is still in session. “Rex vero haec audiens, turbatus plurimum, convocatis pontificibus et proceribus sciscitatur quid agendum. Et commune quidem consilium erat, ut, quia majores episcoporum, juxta quod supra diximus, regi se obligaverant, Romanum adirent pontificem, de perturbatione regni et sacerdotii et reatu perjurii eum accusaturi, et interim omnia ejus in pace essent, donec quid Romanus pontifex judicaret, reportarent.” *Mat. for the Hist. of Becket*, IV. 327. It is, of course, not unusual to find such assembly names as *curia*, *concilium*, *colloquium*, and later *parliamentum* in the nominative.

<sup>42</sup> From “a document of nine articles, which seem to be the heads of a petition prepared by the Londoners, probably in 1215, in which they ask *inter alia* the abolition of all tallages except” . . . (then the words in the text). *English Historical Review*, XVII. 726; McKechnie, *Magna Carta*, p. 236.

thought, just as all marked changes in phraseology do. Much has still to be learned from the language of the early thirteenth century of the growing idea, not only of the usefulness and propriety of common action, but of a speaking and acting nation—an idea which had little or no connection at the start, and perhaps for a long time, with the institutions and practices which finally resulted in concentration of popularly chosen representatives of county or borough.

The last group, consisting of seventeen cases, indicates an approach to an assembly-name. The notion of counsel or advice is more or less clearly present, but there is personification creeping in, and it lies in the direction of an assembly rather than of the product of an assembly. In all of these cases our phrase is followed by *nostrum*—*commune consilium nostrum*. In some of these instances the *nostrum* alone constitutes the hint of an assembly name; in others the context contains an added indication. They have all been found between 1215 and 1236, and all, of course, in the king's letters.<sup>43</sup> At this time the king's council was regularly referred to as *consilium* or *consilium nostrum*, probably more commonly the latter. The rolls abound with these terms, especially during that time of great conciliar activity, the minority of Henry III. Eleven of the seventeen cases of *commune consilium nostrum* are from the minority, the other six from 1215, 1231, 1234 (*ter*), and 1236. Two generalizations concerning them may be ventured: first, in most of them the personification is shadowy and incomplete, the notions of advice and of council are shading into each other; second, in all but one or two of them, what personification there is lies in the direction of the king's council, the smaller continuous body, rather than the larger summoned assembly. The kind of business transacted is one of the indications of this.<sup>44</sup> Not one of the phrases in this division

<sup>43</sup> Probably the unprinted rolls later in Henry III.'s reign would yield more of them, although rather curiously none has been found in the volume of printed *Close Rolls* for the years 1237–1242, and only one each in the volumes for 1231–1234 and 1234–1237.

<sup>44</sup> In this connection it may be appropriate to add that various French cities had governing bodies which were being called "common councils" at this same time. Six such instances have been found in Henry III.'s letters either to or from these cities: 1206, Rex etc. Majori et Juratis et communi consilio Burdegal' salutem (*Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 73); 1219, Rex majori et communi consilio Burdegaliae, salutem (*Foedera*, I. 230); 1219(?) . . . commune Vasacense consilium (*Letters of Henry III.*, I. 67); 1219, Illustrissimo, Dei gratia, Henrico . . . commune concilium [*sic*] Aquis (*ibid.*, p. 45); 1224, commune concilium [*sic*] Burdegaliae (*ibid.*, p. 231); 1243(?), . . . Henrico regi Angliae . . . commune consilium Aquis (*ibid.*, II. 33). And one instance has been noticed in which the French central assembly which corresponded to the English great council was (1185), in a French chronicle, called "common council". Rigord, II. 47.

*must* from the context mean the larger assembly, as is so often the case with *concilium*, *colloquium*, or later *parliamentum*. Sometimes, it is true, it is impossible to tell in the case of a single context which is meant; but taking all these contexts together it seems fairly clear that the ancestor of the Privy Council—ordinarily called *consilium* or *consilium nostrum* in the king's letters—was already in a fair way to acquire a name, "common council", which appears to have been one of the less common of its variant appellations in the fourteenth century. All this, however, can best be left to the reader's judgment of the illustrations; or indeed he would do well to examine carefully all of these seventeen cases.<sup>45</sup> A letter of 1215:

Rex venerabili patri in Christo S. Cant' Archiepiscopo etc. Paternitati vestre devote duximus supplicandum quatinus castrum Roff' quod in manu nostra existere debet usque ad Pascham proximum post generale concilium. . . . Cui volumus quod committatur custodiendum donec de communi consilio nostro provideatur cui committatur custodiendum usque ad prefatum terminum. . . .<sup>46</sup>

The first of the cases in Henry's minority, 1217: "Rex dilecto et fideli suo, Falkesio de Brewte, salutem. Sciatis quod, per ordinationem domini legati et communis consilii nostri, commisimus dilectis nobis in Christo de Ely et de Bernewell prioribus, custodiam omnium maneriorum pertinencium ad episcopatum Eliensem".<sup>47</sup> To the mayor and good men of Bordeaux (1219): "Noveritis quod de communi consilio nostro mensurari fecimus dolia vinaria, quae mercatores villae vestrae Burdegalis adduxerunt cum vinis in Angliam".<sup>48</sup> From 1220: "Scias quod concessimus Roberto filio Walteri quod quietus sit de carucagio assiso per commune consilium nostrum".<sup>49</sup> If this last be interpreted as an assembly name, it is of the larger assembly and seems an exception. The king has been stating why Geoffrey de Marsh should no longer be justiciar in Ireland (1221):

Unde merito ad hoc provocati ut ipsum terre nostre Hybern' decetero preesse non velimus; de communi consilio nostro et assensu magnatum et fidelium nostrorum Anglie statuimus et volumus quod venerabilis pater H. Dublin' Archiepiscopus terre illius custodiam habeat et curam sub nobis donec aliud inde statuimus.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Seven illustrations are given here. The other ten instances are: *Patent Rolls*, 1216-1225, pp. 122, 154, 157; *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 384, 507, 516; *Patent Rolls*, 1216-1225, p. 352; *Letters of Henry III.*, I. 432; *Close Rolls*, 1231-1234, p. 552; 1234-1237, p. 288.

<sup>46</sup> *Rot. Litt. Pat.*, p. 181.

<sup>47</sup> *Patent Rolls*, 1216-1225, p. 120.

<sup>48</sup> *Letters of Henry III.*, I. 37.

<sup>49</sup> *Rot. Litt. Claus.*, I. 442.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 476.

Here is a clear indication of both the small and large councils, with *commune consilium* indicating the former. The next illustration is after the minority (1231), but the king was in France; earls, barons, knights, and others who were to hold a tournament at Alverton on a day named are ordered not to hold it there at that time: "Scituri pro certo quod in reditu suo ad regnum providebit rex de communi consilio suo et aliorum fidelium suorum ubi de licentia regis torneare possint."<sup>51</sup> Here the one word *consilio* is made to do double service: first, in connection with *communi* and *suo*, it means the king's council, and second, understood with the phrase *aliorum fidelium suorum*, it means the counsel of the larger group. In 1234: "Rex dilecto et fideli suo Waltero de Clifford' salutem. Sciatis quod provisum est de communi consilio nostro quod omnia castra que fuerunt in manu Petri de Rivall'".<sup>52</sup> In the letter directly preceding this on the roll, and on the same subject, the corresponding clause has the form *de consilio nostro*. It is believed that these citations show the degree and nature of the personification as far as that can be done here. Yet to one very familiar with these rolls there are possibilities for comparison and opportunities to get the scribe's language-sense which are really determinative in the conclusion. For example, it is noticeable that, although the *nostrum* seems to make this an assembly name, and usually of the smaller assembly, yet the *commune consilium nostrum* is never found following *coram* or the *teste* or in many other contexts of unmistakable personification which abound, especially in this part of the *Close Rolls*, in the case of the simple *consilium nostrum*. And in all the personifications of *consilium*, alone or with the other words, one never reads of its beginning or its being brought to an end, that this was the first day of, or the second day of, that it was summoned for a certain time, that it had been "held" or "celebrated"—the kind of indication found, so frequently in the chronicles, with *concilium*, *colloquium*, and finally with *parliamentum*. It is as if there were a root-idea of calling or gathering and then dispersing connected with these latter terms that is never found, unless by rarest exception, with *consilium* in any of its combinations.

Two anomalous and difficult cases remain to be considered. The first one is very familiar, and the uncritical way in which it has generally been read has undoubtedly contributed to the "common council" tradition. In William the Conqueror's ordinance separating the spiritual and temporal courts, he decrees that the church laws are to be better kept, and he does this, he says, *communi con-*

<sup>51</sup> *Patent Rolls*, 1225-1232, p. 452.

<sup>52</sup> *Close Rolls*, 1231-1234, p. 462.



*cilio et consilio archiepiscoporum et episcoporum et abbatum et omnium principum regni.* The trouble with this language is evident. If *commune concilium* means the great council, then the following words are superfluous and meaningless. In view of this Liebermann seems to hint that *commune concilium* refers to some ecclesiastical council.<sup>53</sup> The difficulty is probably solved, however, through Liebermann's other suggestion of comparing this language with the document of Edward II.'s reign, the *Gravamina Cleri*, which contains a paraphrase, in parts almost a transcript, of William's ordinance.<sup>54</sup> That it was written with a copy of the ordinance at hand is clear. Here it is stated that William made his decree *de communi consilio archiepiscoporum, episcoporum, etc.* This is a perfectly normal use of the term, and, according to the classification just used, would fall in the third group. The earliest manuscript of this ordinance now existing and the one containing the anomalous form is from the thirteenth century—ample time for the text to have become corrupt. The clergy, who in Edward II.'s reign were drawing up their *gravamina*, undoubtedly used an early and correct copy.<sup>55</sup>

The other case is to be found in the rediscovered third original, known as the Hereford original, of Stephen's second charter. This document and the circumstances of its finding at Oxford about eight years ago have been recently described by Dr. R. L. Poole.<sup>56</sup> He points out the variations of this original from the Salisbury and Exeter originals from which our texts of that charter have always been printed. The most noticeable variation is the one which concerns us here. The other two originals end with the words: "Apud Oxeneforde, anno ab Incarnatione Domini MCXXXVI., sed regni mei primo"; the Hereford original ends: "Apud Oxeneforde, anno ab Incarnatione Domini MCXXXVI., in communi concilio". This surely looks like an assembly name; the preceding preposition *in* precludes any of the usual interpretations. The authenticity of the document being beyond question, it stands back there in 1136 an isolated usage in that period.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>53</sup> Liebermann, *Gesetze*, I. 485.

<sup>54</sup> Wilkins, *Concilia*, II. 314.

<sup>55</sup> Is there not another evidence of this in the fact that the word *observatae* after *fuert* in the first sentence—necessary to the sense—is found only in the *gravamina* paraphrase?

<sup>56</sup> R. L. Poole, "The Publication of Great Charters by the English Kings", *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVIII. 446-448.

<sup>57</sup> Speaking in general of this second charter of Stephen, Dr. Poole has remarked: "It is in fact a very peculiar document. It looks as though a scribe familiar with the style of French charters had attempted to produce a diploma in the Old English form." *Ibid.*, p. 447.

The conclusion from all this is so obvious that it needs barely to be stated. There is no evidence that *commune consilium* was or was becoming an assembly name in England except the slight approach along this line which has been noted with respect to the smaller council. If there were anything of this sort with respect to the great council, before the process was appreciably started *parliamentum* had arisen and occupied the ground.<sup>58</sup> And it must be remembered that during all the time under consideration there had been terms used obviously as names of what is usually, and quite correctly, called the "great council"—the ancestor of the House of Lords. The usual names were *concilium*, *magnum concilium*, and *colloquium*. The last term became popular toward the end of the twelfth century, but never displaced the other two. There were others, much less common, such as *curia*,<sup>59</sup> *conventus*, *congregatio*, *concilium generale*, *concilium universale*, etc. As has been shown elsewhere, *parliamentum* began to be used as a name for the larger central assembly as early as 1239.<sup>60</sup> It grew rapidly; it was used alternatively with the names just cited, and those were the names which it finally and directly displaced. There was no era of a "common council" in between.

ALBERT BEEBE WHITE.

<sup>58</sup> It might be urged, *a priori*, that just as *parliamentum* was for long rather the name of an act than a body and the personification was far from complete even in the fourteenth century, so *commune consilium* had had a somewhat similar history, only never reaching the final stage of development. But to this it must be replied that all the while *commune consilium* was a common phrase the old names for the central assembly continued, and obviously as names. But just as soon as *parliamentum* appeared in the field the old names began to diminish in frequency, and finally fell before it. Words like *tractatum*, *colloquium*, *parliamentum* might at any time begin to pass over from discussion to a discussing body, provided some such body were having a continuous and important history. But *consilium* would not be likely so to pass, at least with respect to the larger central assembly, for the place was supplied by the already existing *concilium*—much the same thing as saying that it was already there itself with but the change of a single letter. But the king's group of permanent counsellors was not called *consilium*, and it is the writer's belief that *consilium* did undergo personification with respect to this smaller body; as soon as the ancestor of the Privy Council was important or continuous enough to be called anything regularly, it was called *consilium*.

<sup>59</sup> In almost all the instances in which this word was applied to the great council, some judicial activity or function of that body seems to have been prominently in the writer's mind.

<sup>60</sup> *Modern Language Review*, IX. 92-93.

## THE ENGLISH MANUFACTURERS AND THE COMMERCIAL TREATY OF 1786 WITH FRANCE

THE political history of the commercial treaty of 1786 between Great Britain and France has been discussed at considerable length by both English and French writers. But the influence of the new capitalistic manufacturers in England in the formulation of the treaty, and the significance of the treaty as an indication of the character and importance of this new industrial group, merit further study. Concerning the general history and terms of the treaty, a brief sketch by way of background will suffice.

In 1783, at the end of the war between France and England, the two countries temporarily renewed the commercial provisions of the treaty of Utrecht. But the eighteenth article of the treaty of Versailles contained an agreement for readjustment on a reciprocal basis. This was to be accomplished by a commercial treaty to be concluded not later than January 1, 1786.

The English government under Pitt was not eager to take up the task of carrying out the agreement. This was due, however, not so much to lack of interest as to the unsettled condition of English politics. The insecurity of the young minister's power, the violent tactics of the opposition, and especially the economic disruption of the empire involved in the separation of America and the legislative independence of Ireland—these circumstances combined to force the government to focus its attention on problems more vital to its own existence. As a result, the English were forced to ask for an extension of time beyond the first of January, 1786. To this, on behalf of the French, Vergennes reluctantly consented. For the French government desired immediate action; and to this end it took steps to force upon the English government the fulfillment, at the earliest possible time, of the treaty of Versailles. It issued a number of orders restricting English imports and imposing certain prohibitions, affecting, among other articles, cottons, linens, and ironware. These restrictions and prohibitions, though not rigorously enforced, served the intended purpose of forcing the English to take up the consideration of the proposed treaty.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> F. Dumas, *Étude sur le Traité de Commerce de 1786 entre la France et l'Angleterre*, pp. 30-32; J. H. Rose, *William Pitt and National Revival*, pp. 329, 330; *Correspondence between . . . Pitt and . . . Rutland*, pp. 111, 112.

But desire for a revision of commercial relations was not confined to the French. Although Pitt allowed the matter to be deferred because of the pressure of other problems, his adherence to the new economic school, which favored relaxation of commercial restrictions, is well known. As for the new industrial leaders, the statements of Wedgwood, the petitions from Manchester and Birmingham, and the resolutions of the General Chamber of Manufacturers afford evidence that they were favorable to a policy of reciprocal treaties, not only with France but with other powers as well.<sup>2</sup>

The course of the negotiations, long protracted and involving various diplomatic changes, led finally to the signing of the treaty on September 26, 1786. A convention supplementing the treaty was signed on January 15, 1787. It was transmitted by Pitt to the House of Commons on January 26, but owing to prolonged debates and the enactment of legislation involving the new tariffs and the administration of the treaty, its actual operation was deferred to May 10.<sup>3</sup>

The treaty professed to be based upon the principles of a reciprocal and perfect "liberty of navigation and commerce", so far as concerned the European dominions of the two countries, in respect to the various kinds of goods involved by treaty obligations. This reciprocal liberty included, also, the privileges of residence, travel, the purchase and use of consumption goods, and the practice of religious faiths, within the European dominions of the two countries, "freely and securely, without license or passport, general or special, by land or by sea".

Reciprocal commercial rights were defined and limited by the terms of the treaty, being subject to prescribed duties and national laws. The chief concessions granted to the French were in respect to wines, vinegars, brandies, and olive oil, which were to be admitted into England on very favorable terms. By the admission of French wines at the rate then paid by Portugal, the French won an important commercial and diplomatic triumph, which, so Pitt stated

<sup>2</sup> *Minutes of the Evidence taken before a Committee of the House of Lords* (on Irish Resolutions, 1785), pp. 150-152, 176, 177; *Report of the Lords of the Committee of Council* (on Irish Resolutions, 1785), p. 81; *Commons Journals*, XL. 647; *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, March 23, 1785.

<sup>3</sup> For the diplomatic and political history of the treaty, see *Parliamentary History*, XXVI. 233-273, 342-596, 894-908; *Commons Journals*, XLII. 266, 289, 384, 436, *passim*; Dumas, *Étude sur le Traité de Commerce*, pp. 25-93; Rose, *William Pitt and National Revival*, pp. 328-339, 343; Rose, "The Franco-British Commercial Treaty", *English Historical Review*, 1908, XXIII. 709-724; Brown- ing, "The Treaty of Commerce between England and France in 1786", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 1885, n. s., II. 349-364.

in a private letter, they had "no reason to expect".<sup>4</sup> In the case of most of these commodities, producers in the United Kingdom were little affected by the new tariffs. The chief objections were based on the effects of the tariffs on colonial producers and on Portuguese relations. Concessions were also made to France in the direction of opening up British markets to French cambrics, linens, millinery, and other finely wrought goods, and these concessions naturally aroused the opposition of manufacturers in the United Kingdom. But the principal advantages gained by France were in respect to commodities wherein she excelled because of superior soil, climate, and natural resources.

The principal commodities in regard to which the French, by agreeing to lower reciprocal duties, made concessions to the English, were articles in which England excelled not because of natural advantages but rather because of superior skill and enterprise. Cabinet-ware and articles made of iron, copper, and brass were to be admitted reciprocally at not more than ten per cent. ad valorem. Cottons, certain types of woollens, porcelains, earthenware, and pottery were to be admitted at twelve per cent. ad valorem.

On certain products, as cottons and irons, duties to counter-vail internal taxes were allowed. Bounties on export might also be countervailed.

Duties were specified on various other goods; and in the case of commodities not specified, the duties were to be the same as those charged to the most favored European nation. The most-favored-nation clause applied also to the treatment of the ships of each nation; and any further commercial privileges granted by either nation to a third European nation were to be extended also to the other contracting nation; but France reserved the right to maintain the Family Compact of 1761, and Great Britain reserved a similar right in respect to the treaty of 1703 with Portugal.

The treaty was to be subject to revision at the end of twelve years. A rupture of treaty rights was not to ensue in case of disagreement, unless there was an actual severing of diplomatic relations.<sup>5</sup>

The terms of the treaty that particularly affected the manufacturers were those which provided for new tariff schedules. These new schedules were significant because they were much lower

<sup>4</sup> *Journal and Correspondence of William, Lord Auckland*, I. 154.

<sup>5</sup> The texts of the treaty and the supplementary convention are in *Parliamentary History*, XXVI. 233-255, 268-272, and in *Commons Journals*, XLII. 266-272, 289, 290. The treaty is also printed as an appendix to the first volume of the *Journal and Correspondence of William, Lord Auckland*.

than formerly, and because the English desired the reciprocal establishment of virtual free trade in many of their most important manufactures, particularly in those in which the transition to production by machines had made greatest progress.

The early actions of the manufacturers concerning the treaty were taken under the guidance of the General Chamber of Manufacturers of Great Britain. This body had been organized under the leadership of the cotton, iron, and pottery interests, and had successfully opposed the government's Irish and excise policies.<sup>6</sup> The chamber continued to hold occasional general meetings, but its activity in connection with the treaty was directed mainly by the secretary and special committees. Numerous committee meetings were held, the Lords of Trade were interviewed, answers to various questions were secured from Mr. Eden, who negotiated the treaty, and extensive correspondence and interviews were conducted with manufacturers in various parts of the country. The letters received were in general favorable to the treaty, though there is evidence that special weight was given to the sentiments of the cotton, iron, and pottery manufacturers, who were enthusiastic in support of the treaty, and who had been from the first the chief factors in the chamber. On the basis of its investigations, the committee in charge of the chamber's relations to the treaty met on December 9, 1786, at the chamber's house in Fenchurch Street and adopted resolutions favoring the treaty. It was resolved that "from the best information the committee can collect from the Chambers of Commerce and Manufactures" and other sources, the treaty, based upon "liberal and equitable principles, promises to be advantageous to their manufacturing and commercial interests by opening a new source of fair trade to both nations", and by "securing a continuance of peace and good offices between two great and neighboring nations, so advantageously situated for availing themselves of the blessings of peace and an extended commerce".<sup>7</sup>

Although the committee asserted that its action was based upon the carefully ascertained views of the constituents of the General Chamber, the resolutions of December 9, when published, gave rise to a controversy which divided the organization into hostile factions. Josiah Wedgwood and the Manchester and Birmingham manufacturers had been responsible for the organization and early activities

<sup>6</sup> See the present writer's *Rise of the Great Manufacturers in England, 1760-1790* (University of Pennsylvania thesis, 1919), pp. 62-76.

<sup>7</sup> *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, December 12, 1786, February 12, 17, 21, 1787. The *Gazetteer* during February printed much information concerning earlier activities of the chamber in relation to the treaty.



of the chamber, and they continued to direct its policies. It was maintained by the opponents of the treaty that the resolutions of December 9 were not representative of the sentiments of the manufacturers generally; and the resolutions were ascribed to the fact that "the Manchester, Birmingham, and Staffordshire manufacturers have, of course, great sway in that body". Other manufacturers, it was declared, opposed the treaty, and had trusted the General Chamber to represent their views. But since those favoring the treaty controlled the chamber, the opposing manufacturers, having been misrepresented till the treaty had been signed, "do not know where to communicate their thoughts, or how to collect the general sense and convey it with force to the minister".<sup>8</sup>

But they resolved not to yield without a struggle. In order to give effect to their views in the approaching vote on the treaty in Parliament, they decided to contest the control of the General Chamber by the cotton, iron, and pottery men. On February 6, a general meeting of the chamber was held, and a debate of several hours took place on the propriety of the resolutions of December 9 favoring the treaty. A new committee was appointed to secure further information concerning various aspects of the question. On February 10 another general meeting was held. At this meeting the group favoring the treaty was severely criticized, hostile resolutions were adopted, and the House of Commons was petitioned to delay action in order to allow further consideration. The controversy continued for some time, and, although those favoring the treaty later at one time regained control, the division in the chamber served the purpose of the ministers in discrediting the organization;<sup>9</sup> and those who supported the treaty, and had gained their ends in its adoption, were less eager, apparently, to press the fight in the chamber than were those who opposed the treaty.<sup>10</sup>

In relation to the question of commercial liberalism, the importance of the division in the General Chamber of Manufacturers over the treaty with France consists in the light it throws on the alignment of the manufacturers. The older groups of manufacturers were wedded to monopoly. The cotton, iron, and pottery manufacturers, who were profiting little by monopoly, and indeed were held in leash by trade restrictions, favored the breakdown of the

<sup>8</sup> *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, January 12, 1787.

<sup>9</sup> See below, p. 28.

<sup>10</sup> *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, February 7, 12, 17, 19, 21, March 19, April 6, 1787; *Jour. and Corresp. of Auckland*, I. 429; Julia Wedgwood, *The Personal Life of Josiah Wedgwood*, p. 224; *British Merchant for 1787*, pp. 9-12.

monopolistic barriers in order that they might the more readily extend their enterprises into new fields.

The illiberal spirit of the older manufacturers as well as of the merchants is so well known as to need little comment. Their activities in the General Chamber in opposition to the treaty with France were in harmony with their traditional attitude. Their vigorous and successful fight for the adoption in 1788 of more rigorous measures against the export of raw materials in the woollen industry is typical of their continued dependence on monopoly.<sup>11</sup> The spirit prevailing among them and the merchants was vigorously condemned by Adam Smith in well-known passages advocating freedom of trade. Smith made no distinction, however, between the attitude of the old and the new industrial groups. The interests of the landed class, and of wage-workers, he asserted, are "strictly and inseparably connected, with the general interest of society". But merchants and manufacturers make up a class "whose interest is never exactly the same with that of the public"; members of this class, indeed, "have generally an interest to deceive and even to oppress the public". The "sneaking arts", the "impertinent jealousy", the "mean rapacity", the "monopolizing spirit", and the "interested sophistry of merchants and manufacturers confounded the common sense of mankind". To expect freedom of trade in Britain "is as absurd as to expect that an Oceania or Utopia should ever be established in it", for "the monopoly which our manufacturers have obtained against us" is too strong; they are able to "intimidate the legislature".<sup>12</sup>

Adam Smith is thus seen to have been no herald of the rising industrialists. He seems to have had no conception of that profound change, even then in progress, by virtue of which the manufacturing interests were to become the successful champions of free trade and *laissez-faire*. But while the *Wealth of Nations*, even in the case of the later editions, is singularly silent concerning the change, other writings of the time afford striking recognition of the growth of liberalism among the new manufacturers. The merchants, as well as the older types of manufacturers, were contrasted with those in the cotton, iron, and pottery industries in respect to their attitude toward monopoly. Concerning the manufacturers, the *British Merchant for 1787*, an advocate of monopoly, distinguished between the "factions" among the manufacturers. One

<sup>11</sup> Concerning the wool bill, see *Commons Journals*, XLIII. 634-636; *Annals of Agriculture* (hostile to the manufacturers), VI. 509 ff., VII. 411 ff., IX. 657 ff.

<sup>12</sup> *Wealth of Nations*, vol. I., bk. 1, ch. 11; vol. II., bk. 4, chs. 2, 3. The above passages occur in the eighth edition, published in 1796.

faction is interested essentially in maintaining control of the home markets; the members of the other faction are possessed of a "desire of an open trade", because they, "from their present ascendancy of skill, have nothing immediate to fear from competition, and everything to hope from the speculation of an increased demand". The latter faction the author identifies as consisting of the cotton, iron, and pottery manufacturers. Essentially the same distinction is made by other writers, including Sir Joseph Banks, president of the Royal Society, and Arthur Young. Young at various times condemned what he characterized as the narrow, monopolizing spirit of the older manufacturers, and praised the liberal and progressive spirit which he found in the newer industries. "The food that is wholesome and nourishing at Birmingham and Manchester", he wrote in 1792, "will not be poison at Leeds and the Devises".<sup>13</sup>

That the new manufacturers themselves considered commercial liberalism "wholesome and nourishing", there is evidence aside from the opinions of observers. The alignment in the General Chamber of Manufacturers in regard to the treaty of commerce with France is in itself important evidence. It will be recalled that the treaty, in relation to cottons, iron, and pottery, provided for reciprocal duties much lower than had existed. The manufacturers of these commodities, almost without exception, favored virtual free trade, and in consequence supported the treaty.

The cotton manufacturers were bitterly condemned by the opponents of the treaty for favoring a policy which it was alleged would cause harm to manufacturers less able than themselves to withstand French competition. But they were unmoved in their attitude, and went so far as to condemn in public meeting the action of the General Chamber of Manufacturers in petitioning Parliament for delay in considering the treaty. The vigorous support of the treaty by the cotton manufacturers is beyond dispute.<sup>14</sup>

The attitude of the Birmingham manufacturers in support of the

<sup>13</sup> *British Merchant for 1787*, pp. 8, 12, 28; *Historical and Political Remarks upon the Tariff of the Commercial Treaty*, pp. 166-169; *View of the Treaty of Commerce with France*, pp. 75-83; *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, December 14, 26, 27, 1786; *Annals of Agriculture*, VII. 159-175; IX. 360-363, 498, 499; XVI. 352; XVIII. 327, 328.

<sup>14</sup> *Parl. Hist.*, XXVI. 469, 494; *Parl. Reg.*, XXI. 251, 252, 275, 276; XXII., pt. II., p. 107; *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, October 20, 1786, January 12, February 15, 22, 1787; *Dropmore MSS.* (Historical MSS. Commission), I. 274; *Jour. and Corresp. of Auckland*, I. 429; *Letter from a Manchester Manufacturer to the Rt. Hon. Charles James Fox on his Political Opposition to the Commercial Treaty with France*, pp. 6, 10, 14, *et passim*; Wedgwood, *Life of Josiah Wedgwood*, p. 224; *British Merchant for 1787*, pp. 27, 28, 42, 43.

treaty was hardly less enthusiastic than that of the cotton men. A meeting was held, as at Manchester, condemning the opposition of the reorganized General Chamber to the treaty. The spirit in which the treaty was accepted is embodied in the lines of a local poet, who wrote in October, 1786:

The prospect how pleasing—of commerce I mean,  
When Eden returns from the banks of the Seine.  
May kingdom 'gainst kingdom no more be at spite;  
For both 't were much better to trade than to fight;  
And whilst mutual friendship and harmony reign,  
Our buttons we'll barter for Pipes of Champagne.<sup>15</sup>

The support of the treaty by Wedgwood, the great potter, was outspoken from the start. He was a leading figure in the General Chamber of Manufacturers in its early support of the treaty, and his personal relationship to Eden and the ministry subjected him, apparently without justice, to the charge of supporting the authorities in the hope of personal reward.<sup>16</sup>

The woollen manufacturers were not unanimous in opposition to the treaty. Particularly among the more progressive men in this industry, the treaty had supporters. Their support, however, was based upon a continuance of their absolute monopoly of English raw materials. Their attitude, therefore, unlike that of the newer manufacturers, particularly those in the cotton industry, was in reality an expression of commercial liberalism of a very limited kind.<sup>17</sup>

The desire on the part of the cotton manufacturers for relaxations in the old protective system is evidenced by other facts as well as by their support of the treaty with France. They went so far as to oppose certain provisions of the navigation system, which was upheld even by Adam Smith. Their particular grievance was in respect to the monopoly held by English shippers in the importation of materials used in the cotton industry.

The increase of the demand for cotton beyond the supply available from the British colonies made the question of cotton imports a vital one to the manufacturers. In 1786 nearly 20,000,000

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in Langford, *Century of Birmingham Life*, I. 329. See also *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, April 6, 1787; *Parl. Hist.*, XXVI. 840; *Historical and Political Remarks upon the Tariff of the Commercial Treaty*, pp. 155, 156.

<sup>16</sup> *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, February 21, March 19, 1787.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, April 4, 1787; Nathaniel Forster, *An Answer to Sir John Dalrymple's Pamphlet upon the Exportation of Wool*, p. 12; *Jour. and Corresp. of Auckland*, I. 516.

pounds were imported, and of this amount less than 6,000,000 pounds were from the British dominions. Bryan Edwards, historian of the British West Indies, estimated eight years later that the empire supplied no more than one-sixth of the demand. The chief sources, aside from the British colonies, were the French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Dutch colonies, and the Levant. The imports from the continental North American colonies and the United States were insignificant during the period of the present study.<sup>18</sup>

The problem of increasing the supply of cotton to meet the growing demand had been complicated by the wars and trade restrictions growing out of the revolt of the American colonies. In 1780 the manufacturers of Manchester petitioned the House of Commons to allow free importation of cotton on the ground that their business was menaced by the existing shipping monopoly. The government, in the face of strong opposition by the merchants and the West India planters, acceded to the demand of the manufacturers to the extent of temporarily allowing imports contrary to the Navigation Act of 1660.<sup>19</sup>

Another expression of commercial liberalism on the part of the new manufacturers was their hostility to the corn laws. These laws had long protected agriculturalists by prohibiting importations under certain conditions, by imposing duties varying with the prices of farm products, particularly wheat, and by paying bounties on exportation. England had normally produced food in excess of her needs, but the surplus of other countries was in some instances even larger, and the government therefore put protective tariffs and regulations in the way of foreign competitors in order to encourage agriculture and to maintain a higher level of prices. After 1765 the pressure of home consumption forced a series of modifications in the laws.

But by 1790 it was recognized that the minor relaxations in the control of the corn market, beginning in 1765, were inadequate. Even spokesmen of the landed class were beginning to recognize the rapid growth of industrial population and the consequent need of food supplies from overseas. The loss of self-sufficiency and the resulting problems of public policy were clearly stated by a writer who made a study of Lancashire agriculture for the *Annals of Agri-*

<sup>18</sup> Bryan Edwards, *The History, Civil and Commercial, of the British Colonies in the West Indies*, II. 273; *Life of Robert Owen*, I. 32; E. Baines, *History of the Cotton Manufacture*, p. 304.

<sup>19</sup> 20 George III., c. 45 (continued by 21 George III., c. 26, to the end of hostilities); *Commons Journals*, XXXVII. 718, 763, 764, 772, 773, 786, 795, 853, 883, 919; XXXVIII. 814.

culture. He observed that in the industrial region opportunities for profit-making were so much greater in manufacturing as to draw capital and enterprise away from the production of food supplies. Moreover, the increased opportunities attending the growth of manufacturing had led to an increase of population. Nor was this the whole of the problem, for new manufacturing enterprises had not only tended to draw capital and enterprise away from agriculture, and to increase the population; they had also been accompanied by an "advance in the manner of living and diet". The problem resulting from these circumstances was the problem of "the safety and propriety of relying on distant countries (dangers of sea and enemy included) for the necessaries of life". The remedy proposed by this writer and other champions of the landed interests was the stimulation of production by increased prices and bounties, combined with a general policy of encouraging agriculture in preference to manufacturing.<sup>20</sup>

But the manufacturers were beginning to clamor for access to foreign supplies of food. A petition in 1791 from Manchester and Salford asserted that on account of the growth of manufactures and increase of population, "this country cannot raise corn sufficient for its own support". Similar petitions, urging more liberal import laws on substantially the same grounds, were sent to the House of Commons from Birmingham, Sheffield, Glasgow, and Bristol. Repeatedly, in varying forms, writers dwelt upon "the impropriety of the corn laws", and asserted that it is "the interest of the mechanic to buy his bread where he can get it best and cheapest". The demands of the manufacturers and the expansion resulting from their enterprises were the chief causes of the various relaxations in the control of the corn market. Lord Sheffield asserted in Parliament that the question was one of a conflict between the industrialized and populous northwest and the agrarian south and east of England, and in his view the changes in the corn laws were due to the influence of the former region. "The alacrity of the manufacturer" had triumphed over "the supineness of the landed interest". The acrimony of the discussions reminds one of the famous corn-law controversy of half a century later.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> J. H. Campbell in *Annals of Agriculture*, XX. 133, 134. See also *ibid.*, XVIII. 68; *Parl. Hist.*, XVII. 475-478, XXVIII. 1381, XXIX. 98, 99 (statements by Governor Pownall, Lord Sheffield, and others).

<sup>21</sup> *Commons Journals*, XLV. 348, 461; XLVI. 200, 376, 387, 444, 653; J. E. Hamilton, *Letter to the People of England*, p. 5; *Parl. Hist.*, XXVIII. 1380; Sheffield, *Observations on the Corn Bill*, p. 60; W. Mitford, *Considerations on the Opinions stated by the Committee of Council . . . upon the Corn Laws*, pp. 63, 64; An Essex Farmer, *Observations on the New Corn Bill*, pp. 3, 4.



Returning now to the treaty with France, it will be seen that the influence of the new manufacturers in securing reciprocal reductions in tariffs on manufactured goods affected by the treaty was important. It was even more important and decisive than was their influence in securing amendments to the navigation system and the corn laws.

In order to trace their influence, it is necessary first to point out the attitude assumed by Pitt toward the manufacturers. On December 16, 1785, he wrote to Eden concerning his plans for the treaty:

It cannot be too generally understood, that our sole object is to collect, from all parts of the kingdom, a just representation of the interests of all the various branches of trade and manufacture which can be affected by the French arrangement, and that we are perfectly open to form an unprejudiced opinion on the result. I probably need hardly add, however, that there are many reasons which make it desirable to give as little employment or encouragement as possible to the Chamber of Commerce<sup>22</sup> taken collectively.

Again, in his speech of February 12 in the House of Commons in support of the treaty, he said that the manufacturers "merited every respectful attention", and that in matters involving their interests, "their representations must indeed carry the most powerful weight". But as for the General Chamber of Manufacturers, this body he referred to contemptuously, as if its existence had just been called to his attention. Its petition he mentioned as coming from "a few manufacturers collected in a certain Chamber of Commerce", a body which was absurdly wandering "into the paths of legislation and government", and attempting to take from Parliament "the trouble of legislation".<sup>23</sup>

The minister's purpose was plain. He knew, from the bitterness of the defeat of some of his most earnestly championed policies, something of the power of the great manufacturers who had cleverly organized the industrial interests of the country against those policies. He was forced to recognize them, but he desired at the same time to discredit their organization. His opportunity came when the opponents of the treaty secured control of the organization.

His deference to the leading members of the chamber as originally organized was as obvious as his desire to discredit their organization as such. This is evidenced by his choice of the negotiator, by the securing of information as the basis of the treaty, and by the objects of the treaty.

<sup>22</sup> The General Chamber of Manufacturers was frequently thus designated.

<sup>23</sup> *Jour. and Corresp. of Auckland*, I. 90, 91; *Parl. Hist.*, XXVI. 379-382, 390, 392.

The appointment of William Eden to negotiate the treaty was in itself, in a measure, a triumph of the new industrial interests. As a prominent member of the opposition, he had fought the Irish Resolutions and the cotton tax, and he was generally looked upon as a champion of the great manufacturers. Prominent manufacturers expressed their pleasure, and Matthew Boulton even stated that had the choice been left to him, he would himself have appointed Eden. Lord Sheffield stated that it was not Eden's "system" to knock his head "against any knot of manufacturers". His constant attention to the views of the manufacturers and the cordiality of his relations with them in the conduct of the negotiations afford ample evidence in support of Sheffield's statement.<sup>24</sup>

It will be recalled that Pitt instructed Eden to ignore the General Chamber of Manufacturers as far as possible, but to secure full information from the manufacturers individually as a basis for the treaty. That Eden adhered at least to the latter part of the instructions is apparent. A short time before leaving for France he wrote familiarly to Morton Eden that he was "passing *every* morning and all the morning" in securing information from the merchants and manufacturers. "I do not yet foresee", he continued, "precisely when I shall be able to proceed to the continent. . . . It is some satisfaction, however, that our inquiries go forward pleasantly", with "much liberality and good temper". The attitude of the manufacturers as revealed in these inquiries is significant. The representatives of the cotton and iron industries held that there was "nothing to be apprehended from a competition with the French", and agreed that the duties "cannot be too low". That Pitt made use of the views of the manufacturers in framing his draft of the treaty is evident from his letters to Eden written in April, 1786. "The evidence of the manufacturers", he wrote, "will furnish some tolerable ground to go upon". And again: "The general knowledge from the examination of the manufacturers and from other sources is enough to satisfy me that the general principle [of the treaty as formulated by the ministry] is right". There is evidence, also, that the government kept in close touch with the views of the manufacturers during the progress of the negotiations. This is shown by correspondence and interviews between Eden and Wedgwood, who was regarded in a measure as spokesman for the group that supported the treaty. The government continued to hold consultations with manufacturers after Eden's departure for France; and Eden himself, while in France, not only corresponded with manufac-

<sup>24</sup> *Jour. and Corresp. of Auckland*, I. 92, 93, 164.

turers in England but also held interviews with their agents at the place of conference.<sup>25</sup>

In view of the intimate relations between the government and the leading manufacturers during the various stages of the making of the treaty, their influence may be stated fairly in the words of a writer of the time, who referred to the treaty as having been "framed in concert with the manufacturers themselves".<sup>26</sup>

The government conferred repeatedly with manufacturers of various types, both old and new; but it is important to observe that it was the wishes of the newer industrial groups that found recognition in the treaty. The importance of the newer groups is evidenced not only by their prominence in the process of securing information, but even more markedly by the objects of the treaty. Pitt's view, expressed in private letters, and, in a more cautious form, in Parliament, was that "the chief immediate advantage" desired was "that of encouraging industry and raising the demand for our manufactures"; and the "great and leading" manufactures "which we wish to send to France are cotton, some sorts of woollens, hardware, and earthenware". Again, in writing to Eden, he stated that the idea of a duty as high as fifteen per cent. "on the essential article of cottons cannot be listened to", and should the French insist on such a high rate, "it would in fact be breaking off the Treaty". But as for glass and certain other articles, he was willing to make concessions, "a little adventurously", which he hoped would assist in carrying the point on cottons. Eden, in accord with Pitt and the desires of the manufacturers, asked a duty as low as five per cent. on cottons. The French wanted a duty of twenty per cent., "and some went as far as thirty per cent." He wrote to Pitt of his sense of triumph when, "after much dispute", he secured an agreement for ten per cent., which, however, was later raised to twelve per cent.<sup>27</sup>

Supporters and opponents of the treaty alike agreed that the chief benefits of the treaty would be experienced by the cotton, hardware, and pottery manufacturers.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Jour. and Corresp. of Auckland*, I. 94, 110, 114, 143, 144, 158, 249, 491-493; Wedgwood, *Josiah Wedgwood*, pp. 224, 244; *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, February 21, March 19, 1787.

<sup>26</sup> *Letter of a Manchester Manufacturer*, p. 14.

<sup>27</sup> *Jour. and Corresp. of Auckland*, I. 148, 154-156, 160-161, 484-485; *Corresp. bet. Pitt and Rutland*, pp. 158-159; *Parl. Hist.*, XXVI. 385.

<sup>28</sup> *The Necessity and Policy of the Commercial Treaty with France . . . Considered*, pp. 44, 45, 60; *A Woollen Draper's Letter on the French Treaty*, pp. 5, 26, 27; *View of the Treaty of Commerce*, pp. 13 ff., 20-35, 45-68; *Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, December 2, 1786.

Evidence of the prominence of the new manufacturers in connection with the treaty is to be found also in the debates in Parliament. A member referred to the influence of the manufacturers as a subject "in the mouth of every gentleman" who discussed the treaty. It was alleged by those who opposed the treaty that the new industrial centres were expecting to profit by speculation at the expense of the general industry of the country, and even at their own ultimate cost, because, it was held, their mechanical superiority was temporary, and the treaty would facilitate the acquisition by the French of English machines and methods. There were attempts, also, to discredit the ministry by the charge that it had ignored the interests of the majority of manufacturers and had subordinated permanent economic and political considerations in order to gain the support of the newer men, who, it was held by some, had speculative rather than permanent economic interests. In any case, "the opinions of two counties, however extensive and commercial", asserted Edmund Burke, "should not be taken for the sense of the people of England".

Among those who were in accord with the new manufacturers was the Marquis of Lansdowne, who delivered a notable speech in support of the treaty. During the debates on the Irish Resolutions, he had bitterly condemned the manufacturers for opposing what he considered the liberal policy of the resolutions. On the occasion of a debate on the treaty with France, his attitude was entirely different. After praising the principle of free trade in general, and its expression in the treaty in particular, he said that

he was not the man to flatter any body of manufacture, or to court them for the sake of popularity or any such idle purpose; he despised the idea; but at the same time he was ready to do justice to the manufacturers. . . . When he looked at the commercial treaty, he said he was proud of the conduct of the manufacturers. . . . [They], seated as they had been on the throne of monopoly, had generously descended from it; and seeing the true policy of the measure, consented without a murmur to give up all their prohibitions, to meet the foreign manufacturer in his own market, to travel abroad with their manufactures, and to bring home wealth in one hand and revenue in the other.<sup>29</sup>

In view of the monopolies retained by many of the manufacturers, as the monopoly of raw materials in the woollen industry, and in view of the benefits which the new manufacturers expected to derive from the treaty, the praise accorded the manufacturers by

<sup>29</sup> *Parl. Hist.*, XXV. 855-864; XXVI. 471, 472, 487, 490, 491, 494, 542, 555-557; *Parl. Reg.*, vol. XVIII., pt. II., p. 34. For an interesting tribute to the growing spirit of freedom of trade in England, by a contemporary foreigner, see *Droghmore MSS.*, III. 154.

Lord Lansdowne may seem exaggerated. The benefits, however, were not confined to the English. A critical French historian asserts that

the treaty secured incontestable advantages for our agriculture, and the crisis which it caused in our industries at the beginning of its application was a crisis of a nature salutary and indeed necessary. A great many of our manufacturers, accustomed to the tranquil enjoyment of a monopoly conferred upon them by law, had followed in routine fashion such methods as required no initiative. They were profoundly aroused by the competition of the English, who forced them to abandon their inactivity and to modify radically the old conditions of production and sale.<sup>30</sup>

But praise or condemnation of the English manufacturers is beside the point. The fact remains that, since the reduced tariffs were reciprocal, the advantages accruing to the English manufacturers of cotton, iron, and pottery, the chief beneficiaries, were based not upon the conditions of the treaty, which premised equality, but upon their own superior productive and competitive power. Their desire for lower reciprocal duties, amounting virtually to a desire for free trade, may or may not have been praiseworthy, but so far as the treaty concerned these manufacturers it was a marked development in the direction of free trade, and as such was welcomed by them.

Their liberalism, to be sure, was far removed from abstract theory, although they were not without a laudable hope that its effect on international good-will would be helpful. But its chief source was their mechanical superiority, and particularly "an unmatched superiority" in "the articles of cottons, hardware, pottery, gauze—great national objects indeed". This was admitted even by opponents, but they held that mechanical superiority was temporary and transitory, and not therefore a safe basis for treaty-making. The French, too, recognized the advantages of the English due to mechanical improvements, and sought to counteract these advantages by acquiring a knowledge of English inventions.<sup>31</sup>

The prime minister himself recognized the mechanical superiority of English industry as the principal support of the treaty. Pitt, who has been called a disciple of Adam Smith, and whose free-trade tendencies have been ascribed to physiocratic and agrarian sympathies, was keenly alive not only to the nature of the new industrial

<sup>30</sup> Dumas, *Étude sur le Traité*, pp. 191-193.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 70, 152-157; *View of the Treaty of Commerce*, pp. 8-19, *passim*; *Complete Investigation of Mr. Eden's Treaty*, p. 80; Sheffield, *Observations on the Manufactures, Trade, and Present State of Ireland*, p. 200, 201.

forces, but also to their source in the transition to mechanical production. This is apparent, in the case of the treaty with France, from the care with which he based the treaty upon the views of the manufacturers. More specific was his recognition of the mechanical basis of the liberalism of the treaty in his great speech of February 12 in its support. So far as Great Britain was concerned, the treaty was based upon Britain's "recourse to labor and art", and "energy in its enterprise", because of which Britain was "confessedly superior in her manufactures and artificial productions". His continued recognition of the industrial interests is evident alike from his policies and his speeches. In his address of February 17, 1792, on the state of the public finances, he enlarged upon the vast increase of commerce and industry since the misfortunes of the late wars, and asked, Why this unprecedented progress in wealth and prosperity? The first reason he assigned was "the improvement which has been made in the mode of carrying on almost every branch of manufacture, and the degree to which labor has been abridged, by the invention and application of machinery". Accompanying this was the development of credit in the operations of industry, the spirit of enterprise in the expansion of markets, and the rapid accumulation of capital by the reinvestment of profits in productive undertakings.

In this comprehensive speech on the resources and revenues of the country, agriculture was virtually ignored; it was mentioned in a merely incidental manner. His attitude aroused against him the bitterest criticism of Arthur Young, who charged that the minister, in his zeal for the industrial interests, "overlooks everything connected with land", and that, because of his favoritism, "the agricultural interests of this kingdom perhaps never found themselves in so contemptible a position".

Pitt's views and policies mean nothing less, in fact, than a recognition by him that, by reason of the transition to mechanical production, a new economic era was coming into existence.<sup>32</sup>

The new manufacturers were the product not of monopoly but of ingenuity and enterprise; and they found it impossible to fit themselves into the grooves of the old system. They were impatient of public restrictions, and even indifferent to public favors. The essential tendency of the reorganization of industry accompanying the development of the new methods of manufacturing was away from the old monopolistic, stratified system, and in the direction of

<sup>32</sup> *Parl. Hist.*, XXVI. 384, 385, 395; XXIX. 832-834; *Annals of Agriculture*, XVII. 373.



a fluid, or elastic, or highly dynamic condition. This tendency involved a new conception of the relation of government to industry, namely, the necessity resting upon government to *conform* to economic conditions, rather than to attempt to create or to mold them. This conception, radically different in origin, nevertheless approximated to the physiocratic and Smithian doctrine of *laissez-faire*. It was indeed the industrialist who forced the translation of Adam Smith's theories, particularly in reference to commerce, into practical policy. Smith's darling agrarians, whose interests he believed to be identical with public interests, and upon whose influence he relied for the changes he advocated, became the "last-ditch" opponents of free trade; and the despised industrialists became the relentless champions of liberalism, champions more radical than even Smith himself, who tried to justify both the navigation system and countervailing duties. The work of introducing free trade and *laissez-faire* was mainly the work neither of the agrarians nor of the theorists, but of the industrialists. And their influence, as has been seen, was felt distinctly even in Adam Smith's lifetime.

The attitude of the theoretical free-traders, in contrast with the illiberal spirit imputed to the manufacturers by Adam Smith and others, has commonly been assigned as the basis of the early free-trade movement. Adam Smith said, Let there be free trade. And at length there was free trade. Therefore, Adam Smith is the father of free trade. Such, in hyperbole, is the logic that has gained wide acceptance. The influence of an idea and of a personality is attractive, in part, perhaps, because it is intangible and elusive. But the force of an event is manifest and inescapable. The chief sources of the liberalism of the new industrial groups were not ideas but events.

Of these, the primary event was the transition to mechanical production in England while other nations adhered to primitive methods. Out of this transition there developed four secondary events of utmost importance in the history of commercial liberalism. The first of these was productive and competitive superiority such as enabled Englishmen to laugh at their rivals, and removed the need for the old protective and monopolistic system. The second event was the increase of productive power beyond the existing demand, which led to a positive desire for the removal of the old restrictions and the substitution therefor of a system of reciprocity and of ultimate complete free trade by which new markets might be opened up for the output of the new mechanical methods. This tendency was particularly manifest in the treaty with France. The

third event was the tendency of production to outrun the supply of raw materials available at home or by the use of English ships alone. Increased supplies were obtainable by relaxations in the navigation acts and by concessions to those who controlled the supplies, and this fact early led the manufacturers to favor a more liberal policy, as in the case of their attempts to secure cotton contrary to the navigation laws. The fourth event was a rapid expansion of industry, involving a disproportionate growth of population engaged in manufacturing as compared with agriculture, which led in turn to a demand for the breaking down of the barriers raised to protect English agrarians from oversea food producers.

There is a marked parallelism between the events described above and the events of half a century later when the old commercial system was completely overthrown. The principles underlying the Manchester School, the forces actuating the Anti-Corn Law League, and even the group alignments of the later conflict, were essentially the principles and forces and alignments which had already emerged before the entrance of England into the French and Napoleonic wars. The tendency toward commercial liberalism inherent in the events of the earlier period was repressed and distorted by the quarter-century of wars and by the accompanying deluge of conservatism, and in consequence the triumph of the new order was postponed until the reassertion of power by the new industrial group in the nineteenth century. But the forces which led to the final overthrow of the old commercial system were active and influential even before Europe was devastated by the cataclysm of war and reaction.

WITT BOWDEN.

## THE DIPLOMATIC PRELIMINARIES OF THE CRIMEAN WAR

THE outbreak of the War of 1914 precipitated a controversy of pens which is not yet closed, namely, a discussion, based on the rainbow "books" of the belligerent governments, of the responsibility for the failure of the negotiations consequent to the Austrian ultimatum. Clear as was the main course of events, German and Allied publicists each found it possible to convict the other side from its own documents. And the historian may doubt if time will produce a harmony of views. For more than half a century ago there was another diplomatic controversy which, if more prolonged than that of 1914, like it culminated in war—the Crimean War. The materials for the study of those negotiations are ample enough: voluminous official correspondence,<sup>1</sup> the private papers of many of the chief personages, and a considered defense of its conduct by the Russian government. Yet the most diverse views are still held as to the responsibility for a war which is frequently considered to have been unnecessary.

The Russian *Diplomatic Study of the Crimean War*<sup>2</sup> finds the villain in the Emperor Napoleon III., with Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the British ambassador in Constantinople, as accessory to the plot. M. Serge Goriainov in his *Le Bosphore et les Dardanelles* is less explicit, but he definitely asserts the right of Russia to occupy the Danubian Principalities, the refusal to evacuate which was the immediate cause of the war; while the passage of the Dardanelles by the French and British fleets, which was the rejoinder to the Russian occupation, is denounced as illegal. The historian of the Second Empire, M. Pierre de la Gorce, regards "the distant days of 1853" as "the last when French diplomacy spoke a language

<sup>1</sup> The most extensive collection is the series of papers presented to Parliament and grouped under the general title of *Eastern Papers, 1853–1855* (*Parliamentary Papers*, vol. LXXI.); the more important documents are given in the *Annual Register*. For the French and Russian correspondence, reference must be made to the *Annuaire Historique* for 1853 and 1854, and to De Testa, *Recueil de Traités de la Porte Ottomane avec les Puissances Étrangères* (Paris, 1864–1898), vol. IV. Jasmund, *Aktenstücke zur Orientalischen Frage* (3 vols., Berlin, 1855–1859) has most of the documents, including some Austrian material not found in the other collections.

<sup>2</sup> Written in 1862, but not published till 1878; English translation, 1882.

worthy of itself".<sup>3</sup> So also M. Edmond Bapst's *Les Origines de la Guerre de Crimée* (1912), objective as it is, is none the less a defense of Napoleon III.

It is among English writers, however, that the greatest dissension prevails. Mr. J. A. R. Marriott has recently spoken of the Tsar Nicholas I. as "unquestionably the prime author of the war".<sup>4</sup> Kinglake, whose *Invasion of the Crimea* (1863) cannot be ignored, in spite of its mistakes and its violence of expression, ascribed the outbreak to the political necessities of the Emperor of the French and the frank partizanship of Lord Palmerston for Turkey. A generation ago Sir Spencer Walpole declared that "the ship was steered into the whirlpool" by the hand of Lord Stratford,<sup>5</sup> and Lord Eversley has given a similar verdict in *The Turkish Empire* (1917). The great ambassador is vigorously defended from the charge of provoking the war by Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole, who throws the blame on the tsar.

A popular opinion at the time, fastening on a phrase of Lord Clarendon, was that Great Britain "drifted" into the war owing to the dissensions of the Aberdeen ministry, which could not formulate a policy definite and downright enough to make Russia modify her demands. Any lack of harmony was denied by Mr. Gladstone and the Duke of Argyll, both members of the cabinet; nor is it admitted by Lord Stanmore, the biographer of Lord Aberdeen and Sidney Herbert, who endeavors to show that the policy of the Aberdeen ministry was concurred in by all its members. Mr. Herbert Paul, on the other hand, believes that the differences of opinion were serious, and argues that, but for the determination of Palmerston to have war, Napoleon and Stratford would not have succeeded with their scheme for the humiliation of Russia.<sup>6</sup>

The original issue out of which the war arose was a three-cornered dispute between France, Russia, and Turkey over certain Holy Places at Jerusalem and Bethlehem associated with the life of Christ. Its details are of no concern here, for after dragging on for more than two years, it was finally settled, by Lord Stratford in April, 1853, to the satisfaction of all concerned. But a month earlier Russia had taken advantage of the difficulties of the Sublime Porte to present demands which were considered to involve a virtual protectorate by Russia over the Greek Christians of the Ottoman

<sup>3</sup> P. de la Gorce, *Histoire du Second Empire* (Paris, 1895), I. 216.

<sup>4</sup> J. A. R. Marriott, *The Eastern Question* (Oxford, 1917), p. 242.

<sup>5</sup> Spencer Walpole, *History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815*, VI. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Herbert Paul, *History of Modern England*, I. 311, 314.

Empire. The concessions offered by Turkey were considered inadequate; the Russian ambassador left Constantinople, and Russian troops occupied the Danubian Principalities (July, 1853).

This action alarmed Austria, and in a lesser degree Prussia. They accordingly joined with France and Great Britain in drafting a document, known as the Vienna Note, which purported to recognize the legitimate claims of Russia without prejudice to the sovereignty of the sultan. Since this formula differed but little from that originally presented to the Porte by Russia, it was accepted by the tsar. But the Turks refused to adopt it without certain amendments, which in fact changed the character of the document, and these were in turn declined by the tsar. The Four Powers would probably have stood by their original decision, adding, however, a guarantee for Turkey, or left her to her fate, had not a confidential despatch of the Russian government been published which showed that the Russian interpretation of the Vienna Note was precisely in the sense that the Turkish modifications were designed to prevent, and contrary to the views and intentions of the Four Powers. The latter, in the nature of things, declined to force the note on the Porte.

Before further action could be taken, Turkey, confident that France and Great Britain would not leave her to the mercy of Russia—for their fleets had been near the Dardanelles since early summer—declared war on Russia (October 4, 1853). The diplomacy of the powers was now exerted to find a formula which would restore peace between Russia and Turkey before any overt hostilities, and on December 5 a second Vienna protocol established an identity of views among the Four Powers, on the basis of which the Porte was asked to state its terms.

Once again diplomacy was handicapped by the march of events. On November 30 a Turkish squadron in the harbor of Sinope, a port on the Black Sea, had been destroyed by the Russians, and the answer of the Porte was substantially a repetition of its original offer to Russia. Nevertheless the Turkish note was adopted by the Vienna Conference and communicated to St. Petersburg. Unfortunately, on the same day the tsar learned that the French and British fleets had entered the Black Sea, with instructions to prevent any Russian men-of-war from leaving port. He therefore made counter-proposals. These were indeed rejected by the Vienna Conference, but Napoleon III. wrote a personal letter to Nicholas proposing that the Russian troops should evacuate the Principalities, the French and British fleets should withdraw from the Black Sea, and Russia should negotiate directly with Turkey. Before an

answer could be received, the Western Powers, at the suggestion of Austria and on the understanding that she would support them, demanded the evacuation of the Principalities by April 30, 1854. But it turned out that the Austrian support was diplomatic only. The tsar therefore made no reply to the ultimatum, and on March 27 France and Great Britain declared war.

The fundamental point at issue, which is sometimes overlooked by those who would ascribe the Crimean War to Lord Stratford, Napoleon III., or some other person, was the future of the Ottoman Empire. For half a century the military power of Turkey had been steadily declining, as her wars with Russia and Egypt attested only too well; her subject races, Serbs, Greeks, Rumanians, were demanding and securing autonomy or independence. The reason was that in spite of innumerable efforts to reform the public administration, the last of which, the *hatt-i-shérif* of 1839, had promised to all Ottoman subjects, without distinction of race or creed, security of life, honor, and property, the equitable distribution of taxes, the public trial of prisoners, and the right of all to devise property, yet justice was not done to Christians, and their lives, honor, and property were not safe. But by article VII. of the treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji (1774) between Russia and Turkey, "the Sublime Porte promises to protect constantly the Christian religion and its churches". For this "vague claim to exercise the guardianship of civilisation on behalf of the Christian races and the Orthodox church",<sup>7</sup> Russia now proposed to substitute a definite right of intervention; and it was generally recognized that she had a case for redress. But the acceptance of her demands would, it was believed in France and Great Britain, have confided to her the practical control of the Turkish government, would have converted the inhabitants of the Balkan provinces of the sultan into virtual subjects of the tsar; all of which was opposed to the interests of the Western Powers, and, in spirit at least, contrary to the Convention of 1841, which pledged the Five Powers to recognize the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Right or wrong, this view was sincerely held; nor was the conduct of the tsar calculated to inspire confidence in his intentions.

He despatched to Constantinople a special ambassador, Prince Menshikov, who was not a diplomat but a rough soldier, at a moment when both the French and British ambassadors were absent from their posts, with the obvious intent of dragooning the Sublime Porte into an acceptance of his demands. Neither the quarrel about the

<sup>7</sup> John Morley, *Life of Gladstone*, I. 354.



Holy Places nor a dispute between the Porte and Austria concerning Turkish operations in Montenegro, the adjustment of which was the announced object of the embassy,<sup>8</sup> required the display of pomp and ceremony which marked the arrival of Menshikov at Constantinople and the mobilization of extra troops along the river Pruth. The real purpose of the mission was soon revealed, despite Menshikov's efforts to keep it secret. He desired the sultan to enter into a secret alliance with the tsar, who would put at Turkey's disposal a fleet and 400,000 men for use against a western power. In return, Russia demanded "an addition to the Treaty of Kainardji, whereby the Greek Church should be placed entirely under Russian protection without reference to Turkey".<sup>9</sup>

The proposal for an alliance may have been a manoeuvre for position; at any rate it was dropped in the face of Turkish opposition. But the demand anent the Greek Church was pressed with vigor. Early in May, Menshikov presented the draft of a convention to be concluded between Russia and the Porte and required an acceptance within five days. By this the sultan was to agree:

No change shall be made as regards the rights, privileges, and immunities which have been enjoyed by, or are possessed *ab antiquo* by, the Orthodox Churches, pious institutions, and clergy in the dominions of the Sublime Ottoman Porte, which is pleased to secure the same to them in perpetuity, on the strict basis of the *status quo* now existing.

The rights and advantages conceded by the Ottoman Government, or which shall hereafter be conceded, to the other Christian rites by treaties, conventions, or special arrangements, shall be considered as belonging also to the Orthodox Church.<sup>10</sup>

When this was refused, Menshikov announced that he would be content with a *sened*; and, failing that, drafted a note which should be addressed to him by the Porte, the sultan to promise that

the Orthodox Church of the East, its clergy, churches, possessions and religious establishments, shall henceforth enjoy, without any prejudice and under the aegis of His Majesty the Sultan, the privileges and immunities which have been assured to them *ab antiquo*, or which have been granted to them on different occasions by imperial favor; and on a high principle of equity they shall participate in the advantages accorded to the other Christian sects, as well as to the foreign legations accredited to the Sublime Porte by convention or special arrangement.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Memorandum of the tsar, February 21, 1853, *Annual Register*, 1853, "History", p. 255; Nesselrode to Brunnow, April 7, 1853, *Eastern Papers*, no. 138, pt. I., p. 115; Castelbajac to Drouyn de Lhuys, March 21, 1853, *Jasmond*, I. 57.

<sup>9</sup> Rose to Clarendon, March 25, 1853, *Eastern Papers*, no. 134, pt. I., p. 107; Stanley Lane-Poole, *Life of Stratford Canning* (1888), II. 248.

<sup>10</sup> Walpole, *op. cit.*, VI. 19; Edmond Bapst, *Les Origines de la Guerre de Crimée*, app., p. 490; *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 239.

<sup>11</sup> Bapst, p. 492.

What were the precise objects of the Russian government? In a circular of June 11, 1853,<sup>12</sup> Count Nesselrode, the Russian chancellor, denied that Russia aimed at any territorial aggrandizement, the ruin and destruction of Turkey, or even at any religious protectorate beyond that already exercised on the basis of facts or treaties. "The treaty of Kainardji . . . implicates for us sufficiently a right of surveillance and remonstrance. This right is again established, and more clearly still specified in the treaty of Adrianople. . . . We have, therefore, in fact, and have had for nearly eighty years, the very rights conceded to us which are now contested." But in the settlement of the question of the Holy Places, which had not been raised by Russia, "the equilibrium . . . had been destroyed" "at the expense of the Greco-Russian form of worship", and in addition, considering "all the acts of weakness, tergiversation and duplicity which have characterized the conduct of the Ottoman authorities" in carrying out their engagements, it was evident that the new firmans (those of May 5 embodying the settlement made by Stratford), "after the flagrant violation of the one which had preceded them, could not possess any greater value than the latter", without a guarantee that they "would be executed and religiously observed in their principles and their consequences". In general, Russia contended that she was claiming with reference to the Greek Church only rights similar to those exercised by France for Roman Catholics under the Capitulations of 1740. Finally, said Count Nesselrode, "the careful examination of our *projet de note* will prove that it contains nothing that is contrary to the rights of sovereignty of the Sultan, nothing that implies any exaggerated pretensions on our part or which presupposes a defiance as injurious to us as it is little justified by our previous actions".

Writing fifty years later, M. Edmond Bapst is of the opinion that "the acceptance of the note of Prince Menshikov by Turkey would have placed Russia in a rather ridiculous position"; after mobilizing three army corps and putting her Black Sea fleet on a war basis, she would have secured, "in terms which were vague and open to argument, a right to intervene in the quarrels of the Greek clergy with the Ottoman authorities, when in fact she had been intervening freely and at every opportunity in these quarrels for a long time".<sup>13</sup> And it may not unreasonably be argued that this was the original view of European diplomacy, or at least that the dispute between Russia and the Porte was not really understood.

<sup>12</sup> *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 260.

<sup>13</sup> Bapst, pp. 377-378.

For the Vienna Note, framed by the German and Western Powers after the Russian occupation of the Principalities, was little more than a redraft of the Menshikov note.

The Porte was to declare:

If at all times the Emperors of Russia have shown their active solicitude for the maintenance of the immunities and privileges of the Orthodox Greek Church in the Ottoman empire, the Sultans have never refused to confirm them anew by solemn acts which attested their ancient and constant benevolence towards their Christian subjects. . . . the Government of His Majesty the Sultan will remain faithful to the letter and the spirit of the stipulations of the treaties of Kainardji and of Adrianople relative to the protection of the Christian worship, and that His Majesty regards it as a point of honour with him to cause to be preserved for ever from all attacks either at present or in future, the enjoyment of the spiritual privileges which have been accorded by the august ancestors of His Majesty to the Orthodox Church in the East, and which are maintained and confirmed by him; and moreover, to allow the Greek worship to participate in a spirit of high justice in the advantages conceded to other Christians by convention or special agreement.<sup>14</sup>

Not only did this note satisfy the demands of Russia, who at once accepted it; it practically conceded, by its last clauses, the Russian claim that the Orthodox Church should enjoy rights similar to those of the Latin Church under the Capitulations, although Lord Clarendon, the British foreign secretary, had been at some pains to point out that the analogy was false.<sup>15</sup>

There was, however, no real harmony between Russia and the other powers. The note had been hurriedly drafted,<sup>16</sup> and the Porte proposed three amendments. By the first, "the maintenance of the immunities and privileges of the Orthodox Greek Church in the Ottoman Empire" was declared to depend, not upon the "active solicitude" of the emperors of Russia, but upon the sultans, who "have never ceased to provide for . . . and to confirm them".

<sup>14</sup> *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 278.

<sup>15</sup> Clarendon to Seymour, May 31, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 195, pt. I., p. 200.

<sup>16</sup> Clarendon, in accepting the Vienna Note, had instructed Westmorland "to inform Lord Stratford that her Majesty's Government desire that this project should be adopted by the Porte, if no other arrangement has been made already". Clarendon to Westmorland, July 28, 1853, *Eastern Papers*, no. 5, pt. II., p. 2; Lane-Poole, *Life of Stratford Canning*, II. 290-291. As a matter of fact, other arrangements had been made: the note of July 25, drafted by the ambassadors at Constantinople and acceptable to the Porte. Had Westmorland insisted that the Vienna Conference reconsider its note in the light of Stratford's project, the Vienna Note must have been a very different document; and the dispute about its interpretation, upon which so much was to turn, might never have arisen. Since the tsar accepted the Vienna Note as an ultimatum, he would probably have accepted one that had been more carefully drafted.

Secondly, the sultan would "remain faithful to the *stipulations* of the Treaty of Kainardji, confirmed by that of Adrianople, relative to the protection *by the Sublime Porte* of the Christian religion", and, lastly, the Greek Church was to share only in the advantages granted to the other Christian communities, "*being Ottoman subjects*".<sup>17</sup>

These changes were most unwelcome to the powers, since they could not persuade the tsar to accept them. So an effort was made to assure the Porte that the note gave the tsar no new rights, that the treaty of Kainardji did not involve the immunities and privileges of the Greek Church; and that the note could not be construed to mean the extension of privileges to several millions of subjects that had at various times been granted to foreigners.<sup>18</sup> The powers even proposed to guarantee that the note would be so interpreted. But their arguments were made ridiculous by the interpretation actually given by the Russian government.

According to a despatch of Nesselrode,<sup>19</sup> mysteriously published in Berlin, the Vienna Note possessed three advantages. (1) It recognized "that there has ever existed on the part of Russia active solicitude for her co-religionists in Turkey, as also for the maintenance of their religious immunities, and that the Ottoman government is disposed to take account of that solicitude, and also to leave those immunities untouched". (2) Its "terms, which made the maintenance of the immunities to be derived from the very spirit of the treaty [of Kainardji] . . . were in conformity with the doctrine which we have maintained and still maintain. For . . . the promise to protect a religion and its churches implies of necessity the maintenance of the immunities enjoyed by them". (3) Russia could claim for the Greek Church privileges similar to those enjoyed by the Roman Church under treaties between the Porte and Catholic governments. In later years the Russian government expressed its satisfaction with the "certain vagueness around these delicate questions", which put it in their power "to interpret them in accord with [their] views, which were perfectly proper".<sup>20</sup>

In other words, the question was thrown back to its original terms, should the protection of the Greek Christians be accorded by the Porte or regulated by Russia? The latter still contended that the treaty of Kainardji had availed nothing and was useless without

<sup>17</sup> *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 280.

<sup>18</sup> Clarendon to Stratford, September 10, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 88, pt. II., p. 91.

<sup>19</sup> *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 284; Bapst, p. 497.

<sup>20</sup> *Diplomatic Study of the Crimean War*, I. 208.

a guarantee. The former insisted that the treaty never intended to recognize any right of intervention. The Porte would promise anything<sup>21</sup> except to sign a treaty or note which would allow Russia to make representations on behalf of the Greek Christians; Russia would be content with nothing less. Thus in the proposals made after an interview between Nicholas and Francis Joseph at Olmütz in September, 1853, the tsar, though insisting that he asked for nothing which could prejudice the independence or rights of the sultan or which would imply a desire to interfere with the internal affairs of the Porte, and though stating that he desired only the maintenance of the *status quo* in all matters pertaining to the Greek Church, nevertheless stood by the Vienna Note, without renouncing the interpretation given by Nesselrode.<sup>22</sup> These overtures were therefore rejected by the Four Powers. Instead they ultimately adopted, in a protocol signed at Vienna on January 13, 1854,<sup>23</sup> as their last word to the tsar, the answer of the Porte to their request for a statement of the terms on which it would make peace.

Apart from the demand for the evacuation of the Principalities and the admission of Turkey to the European Concert, the essential feature was the promise to confirm and uphold the spiritual privileges of the religious communities consisting of its own subjects; "and if one of those communities should possess, as regards spiritual privileges, something more than the others, [the Porte] will grant to the latter, if they desire to enjoy them in the same manner, the favor to be put in this respect on a footing of equality"; with the object of ensuring this, a firman would be communicated to the Four Powers and to Russia. This was practically what Turkey had offered from the beginning of the controversy. In her counter-proposals,<sup>24</sup> Russia demanded a special reference to the privileges of the Greek Church—as distinct from the general enumeration applicable to all the Christian communities; to the mention of privileges added the words "*droits et immunités*"—which the Porte and Lord Clarendon had insisted were distinct from the privileges; required that the firman offered by the Porte be annexed to the treaty of peace—which would have given Russia the long-desired legal ground for interference.

Lord Stanmore, who believes that "the objects at which [the Emperor Nicholas] really aimed at that time were neither extra-

<sup>21</sup> See Reshid Pasha's final offer, June, 1853. A. W. Kinglake, *Invasion of the Crimea*, I. 634.

<sup>22</sup> Lord Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert, a Memoir* (London, 1906), I. 185.

<sup>23</sup> *Annual Register*, 1854, app., pp. 498-499.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 520; Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 190-191.

gant nor unjustifiable", argues that the differences between the Turkish offer and the Russian counter-proposals were "slight" and "eminently such as might have been removed by negotiation and discussion".<sup>25</sup> Actually, the changes desired by Russia, slight though they were, involved the whole question at issue; and it is difficult to accept his view that "at every fresh stage of the proceedings Russia had conceded something, and it was probable, nay, almost certain that she would concede still more". There was, in short, an "irreconcilable deadlock".

It may be observed that Russia was always willing to give the same assurances as regards Turkey that Austria offered in 1914 when her ultimatum seemed to strike at the very independence of Serbia; and they carried an equal conviction. For early in the year 1853 the tsar, in conversations<sup>26</sup> with Sir Hamilton Seymour, the British ambassador in St. Petersburg, had attempted to draw the British government into a discussion of the eventual fate of the Ottoman Empire. The sultan is very sick and may die on our hands, said Nicholas. "If England and Russia arrive at an understanding, there would be no further concern." The European territories of the Porte could be formed into independent states, and British interests could be safeguarded by the occupation of Egypt and Crete. For herself, Russia would insist that no great power should be installed at Constantinople; she would support the *status quo* as long as possible, but she would not allow a pistol to be fired for the reconstruction of the Turkish power. The British government politely declined these overtures, declaring that "nothing is more calculated to precipitate [a Turkish catastrophe] than the constant prediction of its being close at hand".<sup>27</sup> But the tsar clung to his idea. On August 6 he expounded it to General de Castelbajac, the French ambassador in St. Petersburg, and probably discussed the partition of Turkey.<sup>28</sup> Likewise he tried to bribe Austria with territorial concessions. In May, 1853, he requested that power to occupy Bosnia and Serbia, with the hope that this would induce the Porte to accept his demands,<sup>29</sup> and according to M. Bapst, the offer was renewed in January, 1854, as a bid for Austrian neutrality.<sup>30</sup> The tsar frequently professed his intention to respect the integrity

<sup>25</sup> Stanmore, *op. cit.*, I. 201, 191.

<sup>26</sup> Printed in full in *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 248 ff.

<sup>27</sup> Clarendon to Seymour, March 23, 1853. *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 258.

<sup>28</sup> Castelbajac to Drouyn de Lhuys, August 9, 1853. Bapst, p. 433, note 3.

<sup>29</sup> H. Friedjung, *Der Krimkrieg und die Oesterreichische Politik* (Berlin, 1907), p. 6.

<sup>30</sup> Bapst, p. 486.



of the Ottoman Empire, but he was clearly formulating plans for its partition and disposition.

Subsequent events have proved that the tsar's diagnosis of Turkey's condition was correct, that Stratford and Palmerston, who believed the regeneration of Turkey possible, were wrong. Moreover, the territorial settlement of what had been the Ottoman Empire, reached after a succession of wars, was in 1914 substantially that envisaged by the tsar in 1853; in some quarters it is doubtless considered a proof of English hypocrisy that Great Britain, which in 1853 explicitly disclaimed any wish to join in a partition of Turkey, has acquired a larger share of it than any other power. Yet it does not follow that the tsar's offer should have been closed with by any government to which it was made. "Had it not been for the Crimean War, and the policy subsequently adopted by Lord Beaconsfield's government, the independence of the Balkan States would never have been achieved, and the Russians would now be in Constantinople."<sup>31</sup> This judgment of Lord Cromer carries great weight, and it is not to be discarded because Great Britain and France in 1915 recognized the Russian claims to Constantinople; for the situation had been profoundly modified by the independence of the Balkan States and by the far greater dangers that threatened from the German control of Turkey. The establishment of Russia on the Bosphorus sixty years ago would no doubt have put an earlier end to Turkish tyranny, but would the substitution of Russian autocracy and nationalism have appreciably benefited the Balkan peoples?

Of course the Four Powers were not thinking of the Balkan peoples, but of the larger political aspects of the whole Near Eastern question, which, they contended, was a problem for Europe, not the preserve of Russia. And Russia they did not trust, as will appear to any one who reads the published correspondence. The tsar might write to Queen Victoria that "in public affairs and in the relations between one country and another, there is no pledge more sure than the word of a sovereign",<sup>32</sup> but the powers opposed to him were unwilling to put his pledge to the test. And that for a sufficient reason. At the very moment when Nicholas was telling Sir Hamilton Seymour that "the best means of ensuring the permanence of the Turkish Government is to avoid worrying it by excessive demands made in a manner humiliating to its independence

<sup>31</sup> Earl of Cromer, *Political and Literary Essays* (London, 1913), p. 275.

<sup>32</sup> December 14, 1853. *Letters of Queen Victoria* (New York, 1907), II. 565.

and dignity",<sup>33</sup> his ambassador at Constantinople was presenting demands which the Porte found "humiliating" and the powers "excessive". Nor was the tsar always honest with his own ministers, for he concealed from Nesselrode the real purpose of the Menshikov mission and thus laid his chancellor open to the charge of double-dealing.<sup>34</sup> Then came the unfortunate incident involving the interpretation of the Vienna Note, and, lastly, although the tsar was unquestionably within his rights, the affair of Sinope, which followed upon an announcement that Russia would not undertake any offensive operations against Turkey, in spite of the latter's declaration of war. Palmerston's criticism was indeed not lacking in fact:

the Russian Government has always had two strings to its bow—moderate language and disinterested professions at Petersburg and at London; active aggression by its agents on the scene of operations. If the aggressions succeed locally, the Petersburg Government adopts them as a *fait accompli* which it did not intend, but cannot, in honour, recede from. If the local agents fail, they are disavowed and recalled, and the language previously held is appealed to as a proof that the agents have overstepped their instructions.<sup>35</sup>

If no positive instance of this kind occurred in 1853–1854, there was some ground for suspicion of the real motives of the tsar.

Those motives were, it may be safely said, to secure a virtual protectorate over the Greek Christian subjects of the sultan, a design announced as early as December, 1852,<sup>36</sup> and to buy the support or consent of some great power to it. Nicholas first sounded the British government, partly because he disliked Napoleon III., partly because he thought Lord Aberdeen, whom he had known for some years, in sympathy with his ideas.<sup>37</sup> Meeting with no encouragement, he turned promptly to his despised "friend", the Emperor of

<sup>33</sup> *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 259.

<sup>34</sup> Clarendon to Seymour, May 31, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 195, pt. I., p. 200. The Russian *Diplomatic Study*, I. 163, admits that the failure to publish the demands of Menshikov was "very grave". The private letters of Thouvenel, political director of the French foreign office, and Castelbajac show that Nesselrode, being of German origin and Lutheran faith, was not entirely trusted by the tsar, and that the religious zealots of the Russian foreign office had much to do with shaping Russian policy. L. Thouvenel, *Nicolas Ier et Napoléon III.* (1891).

<sup>35</sup> Letter to Clarendon, May 22, 1853. E. Ashley, *Life of Palmerston* (London, 1876), II. 273.

<sup>36</sup> Rose to Malmesbury, December 5, 1852. *Eastern Papers*, no. 55, pt. I., p. 51.

<sup>37</sup> Clearly, if cynically, brought out in the *Diplomatic Study*.

the French, whose policy was based on a close understanding with Great Britain, and sought to make him the accomplice of Russian designs. He was so far successful that the Vienna Note was based on a draft prepared by the French foreign office.

But while the content of the Vienna Note was entirely acceptable to Russia, its origin was not; that is to say, it had been prepared in concert by the Four Powers, whose combined pressure the tsar did not feel strong enough to resist. Nicholas had assured Sir Hamilton Seymour that when he spoke of Russia he spoke of Austria as well; that what suited the one suited the other; that their interests, as regards Turkey, were perfectly identical.<sup>38</sup> It was time to prove it. So he visited Francis Joseph during the Austrian manoeuvres at Olmütz (September, 1853), invited the young emperor and the King of Prussia to Warsaw, and himself went to Potsdam. The results were quite satisfactory, at least for the moment. Not only was Francis Joseph "entirely persuaded of the sincerity" of the Russian ruler; his government decided upon a reduction of the Austrian army, and Count Buol, his foreign minister, accepted Nesselrode's proposals as a basis of settlement.<sup>39</sup>

Another success, small in itself but full of possibilities, and all the more gratifying because unexpected, was achieved. Among the personages present at Olmütz was General de Goyon, as the head of a special French military mission. He was singled out by the tsar for special attention, and invited to the Russian manoeuvres at Warsaw. Later Nicholas told the general that he would be pleased to receive the Emperor Napoleon in Russia as a brother.<sup>40</sup> With the Germanic powers in his pocket and a complaisant French general to carry his honeyed words to Paris, the tsar might well seem to be making progress.

As it turned out, General Goyon was peremptorily recalled by his government, to the great disgust of the tsar. Also, the Turkish declaration of war had the effect of restoring the Concert of the Four Powers. But Nicholas only pursued with greater zeal his set policy of winning over some member of the Concert to his programme. In January, 1854, he despatched Count Orlov, one of the most eminent Russian statesmen, to Vienna to secure the neutrality of Austria for the duration of the war with Turkey; the Russian minister in Berlin was instructed to make a similar request of

<sup>38</sup> Seymour to Russell, February 22, 1853. Jasmund, I. 38.

<sup>39</sup> Westmorland to Clarendon, September 28, 1853, *Eastern Papers*, no. 121, pt. II., p. 128; Friedjung, *Der Krimkrieg*, p. 9.

<sup>40</sup> Bapst, pp. 447-448.

Frederick William IV. If these missions were successful, Russia could abandon the defensive attitude in the field and ignore the hostility of the Western Powers. To attain this, Count Orlov was authorized, apart from promises of territorial gains in the Balkans, to guarantee the integrity of Austria, Prussia, and the German Confederation, that is, from attack by Napoleon III. on the Rhine or in Italy.<sup>41</sup> Both the Austrian emperor and Buol declined to negotiate on this basis, insisting, instead, that the Russian troops must not pass the Danube. How deep was the resentment of the Russian government appeared later on the publication of the *Diplomatic Study of the Crimean War*.

This lengthy analysis of Russian policy warrants the conclusion that the tsar intended from the beginning to secure a protectorate, recognized by the Porte, over the Greek Christian subjects of the Porte, and never receded from that programme. But understanding the certain opposition to this from the other powers, he sought to detach one or more of them from the Concert. He failed to accomplish this; but his pride, a belief in the justice of his cause, and high confidence in his military strength led him to refuse all concessions. The principal cause of the Crimean War was, then, the continued effort of Russia, after the question of the Holy Places had been regulated, to carry through a policy which would have profoundly disturbed the *status quo* in the Near East. Whether the diplomacy of the powers opposed to this policy was conducted in the manner best calculated to restrain the tsar is another question.

In so far as the Crimean War was the logical development of the dispute concerning the Holy Places, the Emperor Napoleon III. must bear a fair measure of responsibility. "The ambassador of France" . . . , declared the British foreign secretary, "was the first to disturb the *status quo* in which the matter rested. Not that the disputes of the Latin and Greek Churches were not very active, but that without some political action on the part of France, those quarrels would never have troubled the relations of friendly Powers".<sup>42</sup> Nor was it until the pressure of La Valette had forced the Porte into a definite decision in favor of France that the tsar mobilized troops on the Turkish frontier, and, somewhat later, despatched the Menshikov mission to Constantinople.

<sup>41</sup> Friedjung, *Der Krimkrieg*, p. 17. About the same time a final effort was made through the Saxon minister in Paris, who was a son-in-law of Nesselrode, to establish an entente between France and Russia. On the strength of this Napoleon addressed his autograph letter to Nicholas on January 29, 1854. Bapst, pp. 479-480.

<sup>42</sup> Russell to Cowley, January 28, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 77, pt. I., p. 67. AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXV.—4.

After this, however, the diplomatic conduct of France became pacific and conciliatory. The impetuous La Valette was recalled, and his successor strove for an accommodation between Menshikov and the Porte; while General de Castelbajac was instructed to declare that France did not wish to deprive the Greek Church of any of its existing privileges.<sup>43</sup> During April and May, 1853, when the contradiction between the assurances of Nesselrode and the actual demands of Menshikov rendered suspect the entire policy of the tsar, Drouyn de Lhuys, the French foreign minister, kept asserting that while France would support the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire in conformity with the Convention of 1841, yet the matter in dispute was one to be settled by the powers acting together.<sup>44</sup> In keeping with this attitude, he drafted the document which became the Vienna Note, and he counselled, though he was overruled, the acceptance of the proposals put forward by the tsar at Olmütz.<sup>45</sup> Throughout the long negotiations, the French foreign office sought to preserve the Concert of the Four Powers as the best means of exerting pressure upon Russia; and if its ambassador at Constantinople unduly stimulated the war spirit of the Turks, nevertheless he labored with his colleagues to find a settlement satisfactory to both the Porte and the tsar.

Less moderation was observed by the Emperor Napoleon, who, according to the late Émile Ollivier,<sup>46</sup> was determined to bring on a war, not from personal pique with the tsar, who had addressed him as "friend" instead of "brother", but because the conflict of interests between Austria and Russia in Turkish affairs would, if properly exploited, disrupt the Holy Alliance that had been reconsecrated by the events of 1848-1849, and remove a serious obstacle to the unification of Italy. When, therefore, the Grand Vizier, alarmed by the demands of Menshikov, requested the Western Powers to make a naval demonstration, Napoleon, against the advice of his ministers, ordered his Toulon fleet to Salamis. He was apparently guided by the opinion of Persigny that "the despatch of your fleet . . . will force the hand of the British government".<sup>47</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Drouyn de Lhuys to Castelbajac, January 15, 1853. *Annuaire Historique*, 1853, app., p. 25. Castelbajac was so strongly in favor of peace that he was sometimes accused of being pro-Russian. Thouvenel, *Nicolas Ier et Napoléon III.*, *passim*.

<sup>44</sup> Drouyn de Lhuys to Bourqueney (Vienna), April 12, May 26, 1853; to Walewski (London), May 31, 1853. *Annuaire Historique*, 1853, app., pp. 31, 58-60.

<sup>45</sup> Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 186; Bapst, pp. 453-454.

<sup>46</sup> É. Ollivier, *L'Empire Libéral* (Paris, 1898), III. 188.

<sup>47</sup> Bapst, p. 354.

As the British government did not fall in with this policy, the emperor soon regretted his move,<sup>48</sup> which left him in a false position; he could not withdraw without stultifying himself, yet from Salamis he could not in the least control events. But the withdrawal of Menshikov from Constantinople afforded an excuse for further action. He proposed that the French and British fleets should proceed to Besika Bay,<sup>49</sup> and this time the London cabinet, with doubtful wisdom, yielded.

To the occupation of the Principalities, Napoleon, according to Ollivier,<sup>50</sup> would have replied by a declaration of war, if he had been directing the policy of the powers. For the moment he had to content himself with the Vienna Note. But he declared that the French fleet could no longer remain at Besika Bay, and on August 19 he pressed the British government to order the fleets into the Dardanelles.<sup>51</sup> Late in September, on the strength of a despatch from the French ambassador at Constantinople reporting grave disturbances in the city—which Stratford presently contradicted—the British government accepted the French policy,<sup>52</sup> and authorized Stratford to call up the fleet. Finally, the decision to send the fleets from Constantinople into the Black Sea was eventually taken at the demand of the French emperor.

Not one of these measures was illegal. Besika Bay lies outside the Dardanelles, and the Convention of 1841 could not be invoked against the presence of the allied fleets.<sup>53</sup> Those fleets did not pass the Dardanelles until two weeks after Turkey had declared war on Russia;<sup>54</sup> if they could pass the Straits with perfect right, they could

<sup>48</sup> Clarendon to Queen Victoria, March 29, 1853. *Letters of Queen Victoria*, II. 538.

<sup>49</sup> Paul, *Hist. of Mod. England*, I. 313.

<sup>50</sup> Ollivier, *op. cit.*, III. 179.

<sup>51</sup> Drouyn de Lhuys to Walewski, July 13, August 19, 1853. Jasmund, I. 123, 153.

<sup>52</sup> Drouyn de Lhuys to Walewski, September 21, 1853. *Ibid.*, I. 167. "Lord John quite approves of the fleet going up to Constantinople because it is a war measure, whereas it was only agreed to by Aberdeen for the preservation of peace." Sir H. Maxwell, *Life and Letters of George Villiers, Fourth Earl of Clarendon* (London, 1913), II. 30.

<sup>53</sup> The Russian government repeatedly declared that the decision to occupy the Principalities was taken as the result of the despatch of the fleets to Besika Bay. This was not correct, for the two measures were announced in St. Petersburg and London on the same day, and were, in fact, quite independent of each other.

<sup>54</sup> The statement of Goriainov, *Le Bosphore et les Dardanelles* (Paris, 1910), p. 94, that the fleets passed the Dardanelles in June, 1853, is a clear mistake.



also go into the Black Sea. A policy, however, may be perfectly legal and yet not expedient, and the action of the French and British governments is open to precisely that criticism. They resorted to half-measures. Lord Aberdeen pointed out that the fleets at Besika Bay could not save Constantinople in the event of a sudden Russian stroke from the Black Sea.<sup>55</sup> Later, when the Dardanelles had been passed, the Turks were less conciliatory, which was agreeable enough to the war parties in the various capitals, but most embarrassing to those diplomatists who still hoped for peace. Above all, the proud Russian autocrat was deeply incensed by the steady advance of the allied fleets, and while he sparred for time and kept offering to negotiate, he was less disposed than ever to concede any of the vital points at issue; yet at no time was the question of peace or war put squarely to him. But Ollivier<sup>56</sup> compliments Napoleon for concealing his "*désir intérieur*", and, denying that his policy was hesitant or fluctuating, says, that "if the Emperor came out for war cautiously it was for the very reason that he wanted war".

This interpretation is not necessarily confuted by the next move of Napoleon, which was seemingly a last effort to preserve peace between Russia and the Western Powers. When the French and British fleets entered the Black Sea, with instructions to prevent Russian vessels from leaving port, the Russian government asked whether it would be allowed to revictual its troops by sea and whether the allied squadrons would prevent the Turkish navy from attacking Russian ships on the Russian coast. In the event of a negative reply, the Russian ambassadors in London and Paris were to ask for their passports.<sup>57</sup> At this juncture the Emperor Napoleon wrote a personal letter to the Tsar Nicholas. He proposed that hostilities should cease, the Russian armies withdraw from the Principalities and the allied squadrons from the Black Sea, and that Russia negotiate directly with Turkey a convention which would be submitted to the Vienna Conference.<sup>58</sup>

According to his French apologist,<sup>59</sup> the emperor desired to withhold the answer to the Russian questions pending a reply from the tsar to this communication. The conditions suggested were fair enough to warrant a reasonable hope of peace, and even Kinglake

<sup>55</sup> Sir Arthur Gordon (Lord Stanmore), *Earl of Aberdeen* (London, 1894), p. 222.

<sup>56</sup> Ollivier, *op. cit.*, III. 177, 184, note.

<sup>57</sup> Nesselrode to Brunnow and to Kisselev, January 16, 1854. *Eastern Papers*, pt. III., no. 1, p. 1; *Annuaire Historique*, 1854, app., p. 7.

<sup>58</sup> *Annual Register*, 1854, pp. 242-244.

<sup>59</sup> Bapst, p. 483.

believes the proposal to have been sincere, explaining it by the desire and necessity of Napoleon to keep in the forefront of great events. He had brought on a crisis which made war seem inevitable; he would now conjure away the dread vision, and consolidate his political position both at home and abroad.

One cannot, however, avoid a suspicion that the French emperor was playing a deep game. He yielded at once to the British insistence that an answer be given immediately in the Black Sea matter; furthermore, the language of his letter to the tsar was not exactly calculated to appease the irritation of that proud prince. Napoleon said that the affair of Sinope had been a "check" to the "military honor" of the Western Powers, thus introducing the dangerous element of prestige which had hitherto been kept out of the negotiations; he declared that there must be "a definitive understanding or a decided rupture". He informed the tsar that if the French proposal were declined, "then France, as well as England, will be compelled to leave to the fate of arms and the fortune of war that which might now be decided by reason and justice". It could not have been a matter of surprise that this language, together with the notification that the Russian fleets would not be allowed to revictual the Russian troops,<sup>60</sup> proved too much for the temper and dignity of Nicholas. As La Gorce remarks, the result was only "*trop prévu*".<sup>61</sup> The tsar replied in a tone so haughty as to destroy all chance of negotiation, for he gave warning that "Russia would prove herself in 1854 what she was in 1812".<sup>62</sup> The French government thereupon began military preparations, and on February 27, 1854, joined with Great Britain in the ultimatum that made war inevitable.

The positive interests of France in the Near East were at this time rather limited—the protectorate of the Roman Catholic Church and a vague aspiration in Egypt; the Russian demands upon Turkey would affect her only as they might disturb the general balance of power, although, as a great power, France was entitled to participate in the solution of the problem. But these issues were complicated by the personal relations of the two emperors; each intended to be the dominant force in international politics, each cherished a grievance, real or fancied, against the other. If the ambition of the tsar was the principal cause of the Crimean War,

<sup>60</sup> Clarendon to Brunnow, January 31, 1854, Jasmund, I, 235; Drouyn de Lhuys to Kisselev, February 1, 1854, *Annuaire Historique*, 1854, app., p. 5.

<sup>61</sup> La Gorce, *op. cit.*, I, 211.

<sup>62</sup> *Annual Register*, 1854, p. 246.

the policy of Napoleon, conciliatory enough in the diplomatic channel, but provocative in the direction most likely to rouse the Russian autocrat—"military honor"—made a peaceful solution difficult, perhaps even impossible.

Great Britain took no interest in the original dispute concerning the Holy Places. The spectacle of "rival churches contending for mastery in the very place where Christ died for mankind", said Lord John Russell, was "melancholy indeed",<sup>63</sup> and the Porte was urged to sanction whatever arrangements might be reached between France and Russia.<sup>64</sup> Nor does the British government appear to have been specially alarmed by the overtures made by the tsar to Sir Hamilton Seymour. The foreign office, while combating vigorously the view that Turkey was *in extremis* and therefore rejecting the Russian proposal for an understanding,<sup>65</sup> did not deem it necessary to warn the tsar that Great Britain would resist any design to establish a Russian ascendancy in the Balkans or Turkey. Reliance was placed upon the Convention of 1841 which morally, if not technically, confided the guardianship of the Ottoman Empire to the Concert of Europe. Even the reappointment of Lord Stratford to the embassy at Constantinople, though he was known to be a bitter enemy of the tsar, and therefore suspect to those who did not like the Turk,<sup>66</sup> was dictated by praiseworthy motives. He was sent out because of his unrivalled knowledge of Turkish affairs, and with definite instructions<sup>67</sup> to "put an end to the existing differences", to support the independence and integrity of Turkey which were endangered by that "dictatorial attitude which [France and Russia] have assumed", and above all, to "prevent a Turkish war". He was no longer to "disguise from the Sultan and his Ministers that perseverance in their present course [of maladministration and inefficient government], must end in alienating the sympathies of the British nation". It was only in the permission to summon the British fleet from Malta (though it was not to "approach the Dardanelles without positive instructions from Her Majesty's Government") that the Aberdeen ministry manifested the slightest suspicion of possible untoward developments. The news of Menshikov's violent conduct—he had forced the resignation of the Turkish foreign min-

<sup>63</sup> Russell to Cowley, January 28, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 77, pt. I., p. 68.

<sup>64</sup> Russell to Rose, January 28, 1853. *Ibid.*, no. 76, pt. I., p. 67.

<sup>65</sup> Russell to Seymour, February 9, 1853, *Annual Register*, 1853, p. 250; Clarendon to Seymour, March 23, 1853, *Eastern Papers*, no. 113, pt. I., p. 94.

<sup>66</sup> Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell* (1889), II, 179, note.

<sup>67</sup> Clarendon to Stratford, February 25, 1853, *Eastern Papers*, no. 94, pt. I., p. 80; Lane-Poole, *Stratford Canning*, II, 234.

ister by refusing to call upon him—and his harsh demands apparently did not disturb the serenity of the British cabinet, which declined to emulate Napoleon's example in sending his fleet to eastern waters, and even expressed its confidence in the pacific intentions of the tsar.<sup>68</sup> It was not until Menshikov had abruptly left Constantinople and broken diplomatic relations with Turkey that any positive action was taken. On May 31, 1853, the British fleet was ordered to Besika Bay, and Lord Stratford was authorized to summon it to Constantinople upon the manifestation of hostile intent by Russia.<sup>69</sup>

By this forward step the British government had committed itself far more than was realized at the time. It was hoped that a show of force would cause the tsar to stay his hand; actually his government went so far as to say—incorrectly, to be sure—that the occupation of the Principalities was occasioned by the movements of the allied fleets. The reason assigned for the demonstration was the fear that Russia, angered by the failure of Menshikov, might attempt a *coup* against the Turkish capital.<sup>70</sup> More likely was it a measure dictated as a compromise between the two factions in the cabinet, and as "the least measure that will satisfy public opinion".<sup>71</sup> Any lack of harmony in the cabinet has been denied by several of its members. Gladstone, writing in 1887, declared, "I have witnessed much more of sharp or warm argument in almost every other of the seven cabinets to which I have had the honour to belong".<sup>72</sup> According to the Duke of Argyll, "there was not the slightest shadow of difference among us as to the course which it was our duty to pursue. That duty was to adhere to the principles laid down in the Treaty of 1840 [*sic*]"<sup>73</sup>

The last sentence quoted from the duke is undoubtedly correct. It was the intention of the British government to oppose any action by Russia that would prejudice the independence and integrity of Turkey, to insist that the question between Russia and the Porte was one for consideration by and agreement between the five Great Powers. But there was a marked difference of opinion as to what

<sup>68</sup> Clarendon to Cowley, March 23, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 111, pt. I., p. 93. Clarendon in House of Lords, April 15, 1854.

<sup>69</sup> Clarendon to Stratford, May 31, 1853. *Ibid.*, no. 194, pt. I., p. 199.

<sup>70</sup> *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1863, p. 166. This review was revised by Lord Clarendon himself, and may be regarded as the *apologia* for the policy of the Aberdeen ministry.

<sup>71</sup> Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 194, quoting Clarendon to Aberdeen.

<sup>72</sup> *English Historical Review*, April, 1887, p. 288.

<sup>73</sup> Argyll, *Autobiography and Memoirs* (London, 1906), I. 447.

constituted an infringement of Turkish rights and what policy would best prevent such an infringement. For Lord Aberdeen, who was friendly to the tsar, disliked the Turks because he believed them incapable of reform, and desired peace almost at any price, the essential thing was to keep the Russians out of Constantinople and the Dardanelles. His policy, accordingly, was to avoid any expression of doubt as to the pacific intentions of Russia; to maintain a rigid control over the actions of Turkey, certain, if left to itself, to precipitate war; and to have the Four Powers "adopt resolute and identical language at St. Petersburg, in which the intimation of a desire to see the just complaints of Russia redressed should be combined with a clear indication of united resistance to the acquisition by Russia of new and objectionable powers within the Turkish Empire".<sup>74</sup> This policy of "moral influence"<sup>75</sup> was supported by the majority of the cabinet.

Lord Palmerston, on the other hand, took the position that the occupation of the Principalities was a *casus belli*, and urged the despatch of the British fleet to Constantinople and even into the Black Sea.<sup>76</sup> Lord John Russell, while not, like Palmerston, convinced of "the progressively liberal system of Turkey",<sup>77</sup> was of the opinion that, "The Emperor of Russia is clearly bent on accomplishing the destruction of Turkey, and *he must be resisted*".<sup>78</sup> As the summer of 1853 advanced, he became more and more a partizan of "direct action". He had understood that Lord Aberdeen would, at a convenient time, retire in his favor, and he began to press for the change. In other words, the pressure of the "war party", if it may be so called, steadily increased.

Between these two extremes, Lord Clarendon, the foreign secretary, tried to steer a middle course. He would preserve the Concert of the Four Powers, and thus exert effective diplomatic pressure on both the tsar and the sultan, in accord with his own and his chief's conviction. At the same time he attached such importance to the cooperation of France,<sup>79</sup> for the policy of Austria and Prussia was uncertain, if not pro-Russian, that he was willing to take military, or rather naval, measures proposed by the Emperor of the French. Unfortunately, as has been shown and as Lord Aberdeen himself

<sup>74</sup> Gordon, *Aberdeen*, pp. 237, 248.

<sup>75</sup> Maxwell, *Clarendon*, II. 14.

<sup>76</sup> Ashley, *Palmerston*, II. 274, 279.

<sup>77</sup> Palmerston to Sidney Herbert, September 21, 1853. *Ibid.*, II. 281.

<sup>78</sup> Walpole, *Lord John Russell*, II. 181.

<sup>79</sup> This is more apparent in the *Edinburgh Review* article than in the biography by Sir Herbert Maxwell.

predicted,<sup>80</sup> these measures only irritated the tsar without inducing him to pause, and they played into the hands of the Turks. Moreover, such effect as they might have had on the tsar was destroyed by the prime minister himself. According to Kinglake, Clarendon warned Baron Brunnow, the Russian ambassador, of "the dangers which the occupation of the Principalities would bring upon the relations between Russia and England", but Aberdeen requested the ambassador to consider the words as unspoken.<sup>81</sup> This doubtless explains why "the Czar was fatally misled" by his ambassador.

Brunnow reported that all the English liberals and economists were convinced that the notion of Turkish reform was absurd; that Aberdeen had told him in accents of contempt and anger, "I hate the Turks"; and that English views generally as to Russian aggression and Turkish interests had been sensibly modified.<sup>82</sup>

The occupation of the Principalities, it seems to the writer, was the turning-point in the long controversy. The tsar announced bluntly that he intended to hold them as a "material guarantee"<sup>83</sup> for the acceptance of his demands, and the challenge was not taken up. M. Goriainov, the archivist of the Russian foreign office, asserts, on the ground that the Convention of 1841 did not impose upon its signatories any formal obligation to defend the sovereign rights of the sultan but merely stated their intention to respect them, that "in occupying the Principalities Russia did not violate any formal obligation"; but he admits that "she thereby gave notice that she was no longer one of the Powers that had agreed to respect the integrity of the Sultan's rights".<sup>84</sup> According to the common interpretation of international law, an act of war against Turkey had been committed. Napoleon and Palmerston saw this clearly enough, and Clarendon later took the same position. But at the moment, at the insistence of Aberdeen, the British government advised the Porte not to consider Russia's action as a *casus belli*.<sup>85</sup> Doubtless there were strong reasons for this advice. It was not yet understood that the tsar would make no concessions; the Turks would certainly make none if they saw the Western Powers coming

<sup>80</sup> Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 193.

<sup>81</sup> Kinglake, *Invasion of the Crimea*, I. 136.

<sup>82</sup> Morley, *Gladstone*, I. 361. "The Emperor had been misled by the reports he had received from Baron Brunnow in London and from Count Kisselev in Paris, who both expressed the opinion that an alliance between England and France would not be brought about." Lord Augustus Loftus, *Diplomatic Reminiscences*, first series, I. 184.

<sup>83</sup> Circular of Nesselrode, July 2, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, pt. I., no. 329, p. 342.

<sup>84</sup> Goriainov, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

<sup>85</sup> Gordon, *Aberdeen*, p. 225.



to their support; diplomacy was working hard on a project to settle the dispute; Austria would now be more interested. It is, of course, impossible to say whether a naval demonstration in the Black Sea would have given pause to the tsar, for that policy failed in January, 1854. But in November, 1853, Clarendon had arrived at the conviction that the "anomalous and painful position" in which the British government then found itself "might have been avoided by firm language and a more decided course five months ago", and Lord Morley agrees.<sup>86</sup> Whatever one may think, the fact remains that no positive counter-move was made to Russia's action. Force had not been met by force, and the lesson was not lost on the tsar, who could afford to and did refuse all concessions so long as his troops occupied the Principalities.

The divisions in the British cabinet assumed greater importance as the crisis continued. On October 4 the Porte, in defiance of all counsel, declared war on Russia. At that moment the powers were still striving for a diplomatic settlement, the basis this time being a note drafted by Stratford, which would ensure its acceptance by the Porte. Aberdeen proposed that the note should be accompanied by a declaration that if it were not adopted by the Porte, the Four Powers would not "permit themselves, in consequence of unfounded objections, or by a declaration of war which they have already condemned, to be drawn into a policy inconsistent with the peace of Europe, as well as with the true interests of Turkey itself".<sup>87</sup> Stratford was to inform the Porte that

it is indispensable that all further progress of hostilities should be suspended by the Porte during the course of the negotiation in which Her Majesty's Government are at present engaged for the restoration of a good understanding between the Porte and Russia.<sup>88</sup>

The point of this warning was that the Turkish commander in Europe, Omar Pasha, had summoned the Russian general to evacuate the Principalities by October 18, but without success; actual hostilities might break out at any moment. In this event, Aberdeen intended to leave the Turks to their fate.

Yet this was precisely what certain members of his cabinet had no intention of permitting. Lord John Russell seems to have feared that Russia would prolong the negotiation for her own advantage or cause her troops to advance on Constantinople. So he proposed to add the words "a reasonable time" to the clause requiring the

<sup>86</sup> Morley, *Gladstone*, I. 360.

<sup>87</sup> Gordon, *Aberdeen*, p. 232.

<sup>88</sup> Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 213.

Porte to suspend hostilities, and for the restoration of friendly relations, to impose the condition that "no hostile movement is made on the part of Russia". Aberdeen accepted these amendments to prevent the resignation of Russell, without whose support the ministry would fall, and to forestall the formation of a war government under Palmerston or Russell.<sup>89</sup>

The result was entirely unexpected, even to Russell himself. At Constantinople, a fortnight was considered a "reasonable" time for negotiation. Omar Pasha then began the passage of the Danube, and the resistance offered by the Russian troops was construed as a "hostile movement"! General operations were then begun in Armenia against the Russians.

Russia's answer was not long delayed. Her admiral in the Black Sea, finding a Turkish squadron at anchor in the harbor of Sinope, sailed in and destroyed it. There was nothing exceptionable in this. The tsar had indeed promised that he would not assume the offensive against the Turks.<sup>90</sup> But he and the sultan were at war; the Turkish fleet was engaged in transporting supplies to the troops operating in the Caucasus. But in France and Great Britain the news of Sinope aroused the wildest indignation; it was regarded as "a humiliation and a defiance".<sup>91</sup> It was therefore impossible for the British government, although Aberdeen was reluctant and Gladstone protesting, to resist the demand of Palmerston, identical with that of Napoleon, that the allied fleets, which had been summoned to Constantinople after the Turkish declaration of war, should enter the Black Sea and compel all Russian men-of-war to keep in port.<sup>92</sup> But this was, as noted above, the prelude to the rupture of diplomatic relations between Russia and the Western Powers; moreover, it made the tsar unwilling to accept the terms of peace presented to him by the Vienna Conference. One must conclude that the schism in the British cabinet was in part responsible for the failure to preserve peace.

One other phase of British policy has been severely criticized. After the rupture with Russia, but before the tsar replied to the letter of Napoleon, the French and British governments decided to demand the evacuation of the Principalities. They presented their

<sup>89</sup> Gordon, *Aberdeen*, pp. 233-234.

<sup>90</sup> Circular of Nesselrode, October 31, 1853. *Annuaire Historique*, 1853, app., p. 87.

<sup>91</sup> Walpole, *History of England*, VI. 25; *Diplomatic Study*, I. 334.

<sup>92</sup> Gordon, *Aberdeen*, p. 241; Morley, *Gladstone*, I. 364; Ashley, *Palmerston*, II. 289-290; Maxwell, *Clarendon*, II. 31; Drouyn de Lhuys to Walewski, December 15, 1853, *Eastern Papers*, no. 333, pt. III., p. 307.

ultimatum on the understanding that Austria would support it, whereas she actually gave only diplomatic approval, not a promise of military assistance, which alone would have compelled Russia to yield. The unwillingness to wait for the tsar's answer was due to a fear that the Russian armies along the Danube might reach Constantinople before aid could be forwarded to the Turks, although past experience did not warrant any such assumption.<sup>93</sup> But public opinion in England, which was clamoring for war, was not to be denied, any more than the war party in the cabinet, which now included Clarendon and the First Lord of the Admiralty. The more the pacifists, like Cobden and the Quakers,<sup>94</sup> protested against the war, the more furious did the popular demand become, until it was confidently believed in London that Aberdeen and the Prince Consort would be committed to the Tower for treason.<sup>95</sup>

Upon the matter of Austria's apparent trickery, Aberdeen's biographer has written:

There can be no doubt that when this proposal [to demand the evacuation of the Principalities] was made, the Austrian Cabinet intended to take part in the war which must be the inevitable result of its adoption; and it is equally certain that when the "summons" was despatched from England, Lord Aberdeen and Lord Clarendon were under that impression. Either Lord Westmorland [the ambassador in Vienna] failed to detect, or he failed to report, any change in the intentions of the Austrian Government. . . . What was the cause of this retreat has never been fully known.<sup>96</sup>

Professor Friedjung, who has written the fullest account of Austria's policy, is silent about the whole matter. The semi-official review of Kinglake, revised by Lord Clarendon himself, says: "The Western Powers obtained from Austria all the aid she was capable of giving, namely, her moral support". The probable explanation is that Prussia, unwilling to break with Russia, refused to march with the Danube monarchy, and the latter, knowing that Russia was keeping in Poland "the finest corps of her whole army", declined the chances of a contest which would certainly encourage the Italian states to rise against her.<sup>97</sup>

At the same time the action of the Western Powers was "precipitate, injudicious, and disastrous".<sup>98</sup> Had they joined with the

<sup>93</sup> Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 220-221.

<sup>94</sup> The Quakers sent a mission to the tsar to urge peace. Nicholas received them affably and introduced them to his "wife". His conviction that England would not fight was probably strengthened by this incident.

<sup>95</sup> Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 218.

<sup>96</sup> Gordon, *Aberdeen*, pp. 246-247.

<sup>97</sup> *Edinburgh Rev.*, April, 1863, p. 172.

<sup>98</sup> Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 199.

German states in demanding that Russia accept the terms of peace formulated in January, the result might well have been favorable. The Russian government was wavering, and it later confessed to a regret that it had not accepted those terms in the first instance.<sup>99</sup> But the truth is, the French and British governments, in February, 1854, did not desire peace, and however great the responsibility of Russia for raising the issue out of which the war arose, however stubborn her refusal to make any real concessions as long as there was a chance of destroying the Concert of the Powers, it is clear that she was not given a last opportunity to accept the terms of peace acceptable alike to Turkey and to the powers. When, therefore, the ultimatum of the Western Powers merely demanded the evacuation of the Principalities, without any reference to the proposed terms of peace, the Russian government pursued the natural course and said that the tsar "did not think it becoming to make any reply".<sup>100</sup>

From one point of view, of course, the Turks were the real cause of the war. It was their disingenuous conduct in the affair of the Holy Places which incited the tsar to resume a forward policy, their corrupt and intolerable government which gave some warrant to the proposed Russian protectorate over the Greek Christians, their refusal of the Vienna Note and their unexpected declaration of war which led on to the more general conflict. In short, their purpose was, once the quarrel of the Holy Places was adjusted and they had taken the measure of the Menshikov demands, to bring on a war with Russia that would drag one or more powers to their assistance. By seeming concessions, by clever appeals to Mohammedan fanaticism and Turkish patriotism, by a constant parade of an attitude of injured innocence, above all, by the despatch of that squadron into the Black Sea which was annihilated at Sinope, they succeeded only too well in persuading Europe that their cause was just, their preservation necessary for the balance of power. Their success in this policy is generally attributed to the support received from the British ambassador in Constantinople, who is represented as adapting the instructions of his government to meet his own views and as preventing the Turks from accepting the Russian demands.

The exact rôle of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe is, indeed, after more than sixty years, not easy to determine. He sincerely believed, at this time, in the possibility of Turkish regeneration, provided the influence of Russia were eliminated. He certainly re-

<sup>99</sup> *Diplomatic Study*, I. 434.

<sup>100</sup> Michele to Clarendon, March 19, 1854. *Eastern Papers*, no. 137, pt. VII., p. 82.

garded the Russian policy in 1853 as fatal to Turkey's continued existence as an independent state, a view he was at small pains to conceal from the Ottoman statesmen, over whom his influence was unbounded. According to some reports, he openly rejoiced when the war finally came.<sup>101</sup> Yet the evidence of his private papers, published by his biographer, shows that to the end Stratford labored for peace.

He had resigned from the Constantinople embassy in 1852. When, however, the London cabinet learned of the tsar's overtures to Seymour, it asked Stratford to return to his post. Before he arrived, the Grand Vizier, Rifaat Pasha, had decided to retire rather than accede to Russia's demands for an offensive and defensive alliance or to her programme for a protectorate.<sup>102</sup> This is important, because it is commonly asserted that the Turkish decision to resist Russia was formed under the influence of Stratford. He did support this decision, but he saw no reason why, "if another less binding form" were given to the proposed *sened*, an accommodation should not be reached;<sup>103</sup> and he recommended to the sultan the issue of a comprehensive firman, including all the Russian demands, which should be communicated to the Five Powers. Finally, he refused to summon the British fleet, on the ground that the problem was "one of a moral character".<sup>104</sup>

During the last days of the Menshikov mission, Stratford declined to advise the Porte,<sup>105</sup> but after the Russian's departure, he set to work on a note which should provide a satisfactory settlement. In its final form, it guaranteed to the Greek Church "the perpetual enjoyment of all spiritual privileges ever granted to it, and would accord in addition such other privileges and immunities which His Majesty the Sultan should be pleased to grant, for ever, to any other religion of his Christian subjects".<sup>106</sup> Stratford hoped, so he wrote Clarendon, to satisfy the Russians, get them out of the Principalities, and avoid war, to which he was opposed.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>101</sup> "Thank God, that's war", he is reported to have said when the news of Sinope came to hand. Gordon, *Aberdeen*, p. 254, note. Clarendon wrote: "He is bent on war, and on playing the first part in settling the great Eastern question, as Lady S. de R. admitted to me . . . he now considered it." Maxwell, *Clarendon*, II. 29.

<sup>102</sup> Lane-Poole, *Stratford Canning*, II. 248.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 264.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 266.

<sup>105</sup> Stratford to Clarendon, May 22, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 234, pt. I., p. 235.

<sup>106</sup> Protocol of Balta Liman, July 25, 1853. De Testa, *Recueil de Traités de la Porte Ottomane*, vol. IV., pt. II., p. 308.

<sup>107</sup> Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, II. 283.

These plans were upset by the Vienna Note, which Stratford was ordered to recommend to the Porte, although it differed in several vital respects from his own project. The ambassador did recommend the note; but according to Sir Spencer Walpole, "the universal judgment of historians is that the Sultan's Ministers, in demanding the alteration of the note, carried out the private views and disregarded the official language of Lord Stratford".<sup>108</sup> Kinglake, Herbert Paul, Lord Eversley, and the French historians do take this view. It seems to have been held even by Clarendon,<sup>109</sup> who never wholly trusted the discretion of Stratford and often referred to him as "the Sultan". Yet, unless Mr. Lane-Poole has deliberately suppressed damaging letters in the ambassador's private correspondence, the charge will not stand.

When the Grand Vizier said that the note was unacceptable without amendments, Stratford suggested that "the Porte should signify its acceptance of the Note under its own construction of the objectionable passages, and for securities rely on the assent and sanction of the Powers". He concealed from Reshid Pasha his private approval of the Turkish modifications, he "scrupulously abstained from expressing any private opinion on the merit of Count Buol's Note, while it was under consideration", and to Clarendon he quoted Reshid as saying that "no personal influence could have induced the Porte to give way". To Westmorland he declared "wholly unfounded" any "insinuations" that he had "rather hindered than promoted the acceptance of Count Buol's Note". A member of the embassy staff wrote Lady Stratford that "whatever Lord S's private opinion may be, you may rest assured that this has in no way added to the Turks' exaltations by influencing them one way or the other".<sup>110</sup>

It is to be remembered that the Vienna Note differed little from the Menshikov ultimatum, radically from Stratford's own scheme of July 25. No great perspicacity was required for the Porte to determine what Stratford's real opinions were. The real blame for the rejection of the Vienna Note, so far as it was due to outside pressure, must probably be laid to the French ambassador. La Cour advised the acceptance of the note, but he helped draw up the Turkish amendments, "made inquiries about landing troops on the coasts of Turkey, and even asked whether the Porte considered the Dardanelles as already open to the passage of the Allied squad-

<sup>108</sup> *Cambridge Modern History*, XI. 314.

<sup>109</sup> *Edinburgh Rev.*, April, 1863, p. 171.

<sup>110</sup> Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, II. 291-296.

rons".<sup>111</sup> It is significant that shortly afterward the passage of the Straits was twice urged by the French government.

By the beginning of September Stratford was convinced that the Turks were "bent on war", which Clarendon suspected him of desiring and provoking.<sup>112</sup> In point of fact, he was seeking to prevent it. He calmed a war demonstration in the Turkish capital by quietly bringing up a couple of British frigates. He advised against the Turkish declaration of war, and then held out against the French ambassador, who desired to summon the fleets forthwith;<sup>113</sup> indeed not until the Russians had refused to evacuate the Principalities and positive orders had been received from London did Stratford bring the British fleet to Constantinople, and then only a part of it.<sup>114</sup>

One explanation of this reluctance is that the ambassador was drafting a new note for the Porte to present to Russia. Based on the Turkish amendments to the Vienna Note, it was to be accompanied by a "declaration of the Four Powers, bearing something of the character of a guarantee, with an annexed Note in which all reasonable confirmation and warranty of the rights of the Greek Church were to be formally granted by the Sultan".<sup>115</sup> "A forlorn hope", Stratford called it;<sup>116</sup> but he secured from Reshid a promise that hostilities would not be opened before November 1. Actually Omar Pasha crossed the Danube on October 27, and the war was really begun. Henceforth the ambassador seems to have worked on the principle that "war is the decree of the Fates, and our wisest part will be to do what we can to bring it to a thoroughly good conclusion".<sup>117</sup>

But he was not "just as wild as the Turks themselves",<sup>118</sup> as Clarendon complained. He prevented, on November 5, the despatch of the Turkish fleet into the Black Sea; and when later the Turks, despite him, sent out some of their smaller vessels, he tried, but failed, owing to dissensions between the French and British admirals, to have them followed up by allied ships, which would have kept the peace and prevented the battle of Sinope.<sup>119</sup> After this affair he drafted a note, signed by his colleagues, proposing terms

<sup>111</sup> Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, II. 292.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 299; Maxwell, *Clarendon*, II. 29.

<sup>113</sup> Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, II. 309.

<sup>114</sup> Bapst, pp. 455-456.

<sup>115</sup> Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, II. 279.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 311.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>118</sup> Maxwell, *Clarendon*, II. 29.

<sup>119</sup> Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, II. 328-329; Stanmore, *Sidney Herbert*, I. 198.



on which the Porte might make peace. Substantially the same as the second Vienna Note (December 5), which arrived the following day, it was perhaps Stratford's greatest triumph. For it embodied the promise to confirm all the ancient privileges of the Greek Church,<sup>120</sup> a promise most reluctantly given, for the Turks believed that France and Great Britain would under no circumstances desert them. Stratford had carried his point by refusing otherwise to send the fleets into the Black Sea,<sup>121</sup> although he considered that action an absolute necessity,<sup>122</sup> and by threatening to leave Turkey to her fate in the event of massacres in the city, which were feared owing to the restlessness of the *softas*.<sup>123</sup>

After this Stratford played little part in the course of events, which was directed by the chanceries of Europe. He had used every power to keep the Turks in line, to extort concessions, to prevent actual hostilities, except that he refused privately to advise the full acceptance of the Russian demands. At all times he sought to work in harmony with the other diplomatists in Constantinople; he was more restrained than his French colleague. No doubt he was anti-Russian and pro-Turk, and the hopes that he entertained for his *protégés* were never fulfilled. But he strove honestly for peace, as he understood the problem, and his conduct was formally approved by his government.

Perhaps the strangest aspect of the long negotiations was the attitude of Austria. The Hapsburg monarchy was directly interested in the Russian programme, for if the tsar should secure a protectorate over the Greek Christians of Turkey, a large proportion of whom were Slavs, the reaction upon the Slav subjects of Francis Joseph, smarting as they were under the treatment accorded them during and after the Revolution of 1848, would be certain and perhaps serious.<sup>124</sup> For this reason several Austrian diplomatists, notably Hübner at Paris and Prokesch-Osten at Frankfort, desired that Austria co-operate with the Western Powers to block the ambitions of Russia. But the feudal aristocracy and many of the leading generals remembered the services of the Russian army in sup-

<sup>120</sup> Note of December 13, 1853. *Annual Register*, 1854, p. 496.

<sup>121</sup> Stratford to Reshid, December 12, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 371, pt. II., p. 341.

<sup>122</sup> Lane-Poole, *op. cit.*, II. 330.

<sup>123</sup> Stratford to Reshid, December 21, 1853. *Eastern Papers*, no. 373, pt. II., p. 344.

<sup>124</sup> In the autumn of 1853, the tsar gave assurances that neither he nor his son would countenance any movements against the Austrian government by its Slav subjects. Friedjung, *Der Krimkrieg*, p. 14. This book is the chief authority for the following paragraphs.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXV.—5.

pressing the Magyars, and they disliked Great Britain as the home of liberalism, as the refuge of Kossuth and other exiles. Baron Brück, the ambassador at Constantinople, anticipating by half a century the *Drang nach Osten* of our time, regarded Great Britain as the chief commercial rival of the German Powers in the Near East, was therefore jealous of Stratford, and advocated a common policy for Austria and Prussia which would at once give pause to Russia and challenge the ascendancy of Stratford at the Porte. The emperor himself was young and inexperienced, he dreaded the thought of a rupture with the tsar to whom he owed such a debt and whom he regarded as the bulwark of conservatism. A further difficulty arose from the general reluctance to join in any enterprise with Napoleon III., who was regarded as the champion of Italian nationality and the opponent of the Austrian system in the peninsula.

Between such conflicting currents, Count Buol, who was not a man of dominating character, pursued a weak and vacillating policy. Not until the occupation of the Principalities did he take any active part in the negotiations. His policy then was to force upon Turkey the acceptance of the Russian programme; he continued to recommend the Vienna Note after the Western Powers had abandoned it; he found the assurances of the tsar at Olmütz satisfactory; he refused to support Stratford's "forlorn hope". Likewise the Emperor Francis Joseph, who declared to the Russian ambassador in Vienna that Austria would never ally herself with the Western Powers,<sup>125</sup> and to Nesselrode at Olmütz that he would remain true to his old alliance on condition that the Russians did not cross the Danube.<sup>126</sup> When, in addition, the Austrian army was reduced, the tsar had reason to suppose that he could count on Austrian neutrality<sup>127</sup>—and acted accordingly.

Early in 1854, however, the policy of Austria grew distinctly hostile to Russia. Count Orlov was unable to secure a promise of permanent neutrality from Francis Joseph; he admitted that the tsar aimed at the creation of vassal states in the Balkans under the protection of Russia. The offer to share this protectorate was rejected; instead the emperor demanded that Russia conduct her campaign exclusively in Asia.<sup>128</sup> The ministry had already determined to resist any further advance by Russia in the Balkans, by diplomacy

<sup>125</sup> Friedjung, p. 7.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>127</sup> Austria actually issued a declaration of neutrality when the Turks declared war. This was unfavorably viewed by the Western Powers.

<sup>128</sup> Friedjung, pp. 17-18.

if possible, by force if necessary; and the troops on the Hungarian frontier were reinforced. But it was not until March 22, on the very day that the Russians crossed the Danube and nearly a month after the ultimatum of the Western Powers, that the decision was finally made to place the Austrian army on a war footing; furthermore, any action was to be dependent on the support of Prussia, and the treaty of alliance with that power was concluded only on April 20.<sup>129</sup>

Thus the policy of Austria, energetically as it finally manifested itself, was of no assistance to France and Great Britain in the final play. One cannot say that she deliberately allowed the Western Powers to pull her chestnuts out of the fire, though she has been roundly accused of it; but she certainly did not give them that whole-hearted support which would have confronted the tsar with the solid front of Europe and in all probability have constrained him to moderate his demands upon Turkey.

Of Prussia little need be said. She had no direct interest in the question, and therefore no policy.<sup>130</sup> In a vague way she supported Austria, but King Frederick William IV., the brother-in-law of the tsar, was almost pro-Russian, and the anti-Russian party was powerless because of its liberal leanings. For practical purposes, Prussia pursued a policy of neutrality, though not of the straightforward variety advocated by Bismarck.

Certain conclusions may be briefly stated. The tsar knew from the beginning what he wanted, and observing that Europe would not unite to oppose him, yielded none of his demands, the acceptance of which by Turkey would at least have upset the *status quo* in the Near East. Napoleon probably desired war, but made a parade of pacific intentions. Great Britain at the outset unquestionably desired peace, but did not make clear that the designs of Russia would be resisted, by force if necessary, thereby encouraging the tsar to stand his ground. Austria's attitude, until too late, was equally uncertain. The Turks<sup>131</sup> played their game admirably. In the face of such confusion war could have been avoided only by a miracle.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 19, 43-44.

<sup>130</sup> Loftus, *Diplomatic Reminiscences*, first series, vol. I., chs. XIV.-XVI.

<sup>131</sup> The tsar spoke to Castelbajac of "*ces misérables Turcs*", and Clarendon qualified them as "beastly".

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

### NOTES ON THE BEGINNINGS OF AERONAUTICS IN AMERICA

IN view of the important part played in the Great War by aircraft of various sorts, it is interesting to know that, more than a century and a quarter ago, three of the founders of the American Republic, signers of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and Francis Hopkinson, were intensely interested in this subject, and definitely predicted the part that navigation of the air was to play in subsequent history.

The history of modern aeronautics begins on June 5, 1783, when the Montgolfier brothers, Joseph Michel and Jacques Étienne, gave a public demonstration of their discoveries by sending up at Annonay, France, a large hot-air balloon. That this demonstration, which attracted so much attention in France, aroused almost an equal amount of interest in America is proved by the fact that during the next winter a correspondent in America of the *Journal de Paris* contributed to that paper a fictitious account of a balloon ascension which purported to have taken place in Philadelphia in the latter part of 1783.

According to this story, which was published May 13, 1784, "Ritnose" and "Opquisne", members of the "Philosophical Academy",<sup>1</sup> sent up, on December 28 of the preceding year, forty-seven small balloons, attached to a cage, in which they placed, first animals, and later "Gimes Ouilcoxe" (James Wilcox), a local carpenter. When the latter saw that he was approaching the "Scoul-quille" River, he became alarmed and punctured some of his balloons and so brought himself down.

This story is a pure myth. There is no mention of the event in the records of the American Philosophical Society, in William Barton's *Life of David Rittenhouse*, in the correspondence of Francis Hopkinson,<sup>2</sup> or in Jacob Hiltzheimer's *Diary*—which does record the first real ascension. Nevertheless, it was generally accepted as true; it was quoted in Hatton Turnor's elaborate history of aeronautics, *Astra Castra*, and is repeated in the eleventh edition of the

<sup>1</sup> This evidently refers to David Rittenhouse and Francis Hopkinson, prominent members of the American Philosophical Society.

<sup>2</sup> The author of this article has written a life of Francis Hopkinson, which is deposited among the doctoral theses in the Harvard College Library.

*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, although the hoax was thoroughly exposed in the thirty-fifth volume of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*.<sup>3</sup>

Although this particular story is undoubtedly apocryphal, Francis Hopkinson and a number of his friends, including Jefferson and Franklin, followed the early experiments in aeronautics with close attention. The first indication of this is found in the following extract from a letter written by Jefferson, at Annapolis, to Hopkinson, at Philadelphia, on February 18, 1784:

What think you of these ballons [*sic*]? They really begin to assume a serious face. The Cheval'r Luzerne<sup>4</sup> communicated to me a letter received from his brother, who mentions one which he had seen himself. The persons who ascended in it regulated its height at about 3000 feet and passed with the wind about 6 miles in 20 minutes when they chose to let themselves down, tho' they could have traveled triple the distance. This discovery seems to threaten the prostration of fortified works unless they can be closed above, the destruction of fleets, and what not. The French may now run over their laces, wines etc. to England duty free. The whole system of British statutes made on the supposition of goods being brought into some port must be revised; inland countries may now become maritime states unless you chuse rather to call them aerial, as their commerce is in future to be carried on through that element—but jesting apart, I think this discovery may lead to things useful—for instance there is no longer a difficulty how Congress may move backwards and forwards and your bungling scheme of moving houses and moving towns is quite superseded;<sup>5</sup> we shall soar sublime above the clouds.<sup>6</sup>

Hopkinson's reply to this letter opens with a sentence which clearly disproves the story published in the *Journal de Paris*.

We have not taken the affair of the *Balloons* in hand. A high flying politician is, I think, not unlike a Balloon—he is full of inflammability, he is driven along by every current of wind and those who will suffer themselves to be carried up by them run a great Risk that the Bubble may burst and let them fall from the Height to which the *principle of Levity* has raised them.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Jackson, "The First Balloon Hoax", *Pa. Mag. Hist.*, XXXV. 51–58. [An examination of the original text in the *Journal de Paris* of May 13, 1784 (p. 585), of which Mr. Jackson seems to have had only a contemporary translation, has led the editor of this *Review* to think that, while the narrative is indeed fictitious, Mr. Jackson's conclusions as to the origin of the hoax are open to modification. Ed.]

<sup>4</sup> French minister. The ascent described by his brother was that of Pilâtre de Rozier, November 21, 1783.

<sup>5</sup> Jefferson was a member of Congress, which was at that time in session at Annapolis. He refers here to an essay of Hopkinson's entitled "A Summary of Some Late Proceedings"; which ridicules the inability of Congress to decide on a permanent place of meeting.

<sup>6</sup> This letter is among the papers of Edward Hopkinson, Esq., of Philadelphia.

<sup>7</sup> Hopkinson to Jefferson, March 12, 1784. Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress.

Again, on March 31, he says,

A gentleman in Town is making an air Balloon of 6 feet Diameter; it is now almost completed—what the Success will be Time must show. . . .

Congress imagined that when they removed to Annapolis to *pout* we should all be in deep Distress—and for every *Pout* return a *Sigh*—but the Event is far otherwise. The name of Congress is almost forgotten and for every Person that will mention that respectable Body, a hundred will talk of an air balloon. I have a singular Regard for Congress, and will therefore ask an unfashionable Question, when may we hope to see Congress this way? and what are they doing? But I grow saucy and have not Time, now, even for that.<sup>8</sup>

On May 12 Hopkinson sent his friend a still more important chapter in the history of aeronautics, since his letter gives the actual date of the first balloon ascension in Philadelphia:

We have been amusing ourselves with raising Air Balloons made of Paper. The first that mounted our Atmosphere was made by Dr. Foulk and sent up from the Garden of the Minister of Holland the Day before yesterday. Yesterday, however, the same Balloon was raised from Mr. Morris's Garden, and last Evening another was exhibited at the Minister of France's, to the great amusement of the Spectators. They were twice or perhaps three times the Height of the Houses; and then gently descended without Damage. They were open at Bottom and of course the Gas soon wasted. I am contriving a better Method of filling them.<sup>9</sup>

Nine days later, May 21, Jefferson, now in Philadelphia, writes thence to Monroe, "I have had the pleasure of seeing 3 balons here. The largest was of 8 f. diameter and ascended about 300 feet."<sup>10</sup>

A letter written by Hopkinson to Franklin on May 24, 1784, continues the history of balloon experiments in Philadelphia and reveals the very interesting fact that the active mind of Hopkinson had already foreseen the invention of the dirigible:

We have been diverting ourselves with raising Paper Balloons by means of burnt Straw, to the great astonishment of the Populace. This Discovery, like Electricity, Magnetism, and many other important Phaenomena, serve for amusement at first—its uses and applications will hereafter unfold themselves. There may be many mechanical means of giving the Balloon a progressive motion other than what the current of wind would give it—perhaps this is as simple as any—let the Balloon be constructed of an oblong Form something like the body of a Fish, or a Bird, or a Wherry, and let there be a large and light wheel on the Stern, vertically mounted. This wheel should consist of several Vanes or Fans of Canvas, whose plains should be considerably inclined with respect to the Plain of its motion, exactly like the wheel of a Smoake-Jack. If the

<sup>8</sup> Hopkinson to Jefferson, March 31, 1784. Jefferson Papers.

<sup>9</sup> Same to same, May 12, 1784. *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Writings*, ed. Ford, III. 496.

navigator turns this wheel swiftly round, by means of a winch, there is no Doubt but it would (in a Calm at least) give the Machine a Progressive motion, upon the same Principle that a Boat is *scull'd thro'* the water.<sup>11</sup>

After Jefferson's appointment as minister to France in 1784, he sent Hopkinson two bits of news about the progress of aeronautics in Europe, and one to Monroe. Writing from Paris to the former on January 13, 1785, he says:

Mr. Blanchard of this country and Dr. Jeffries of Massachusetts arrived here the day before yesterday from Dover, having crossed the Channel on the 7th in a Balloon. They were two hours from land to land. It was filled with inflammable air. We are told here of a method of extracting this from soft coal cheaply and speedily, but it is not yet reduced to experience.<sup>12</sup>

To Monroe, in a postscript to a letter dated Paris, June 17, 1785, in which allusion had been made to Pilâtre de Rozier's unfortunate attempt to cross the Channel in the opposite direction (June 15), Jefferson wrote:

Since writing the above we receive the following account. Mons. Pilatre de Rosiere, who has been waiting some months at Boulogne for a fair wind to cross the channel, at length took his ascent with a companion. The wind changed after a while and brought him back on the French coast. Being at a height of about 6000 f. some accident happened to his baloon of inflammable air. It burst, they fell from that height and were crushed to atoms. There was a Montgolfier combined with the baloon of inflammable air. It is suspected the heat of the Montgolfier rarified too much the inflammable air of the other and occasioned it to burst. The Montgolfier came down in good order.<sup>13</sup>

And finally on September 25 of the same year he wrote to Hopkinson:

Arts and arms are alike asleep for the moment. Ballooning indeed goes on. There are two artists in the neighborhood of Paris who seem to be advancing towards the desideratum in this business. They are able to rise and fall at will, without expending their gas, and to deflect forty-five degrees from the course of the wind.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Letter in the American Philosophical Society, Franklin Papers, XXXI. 185. The *Boston Magazine* for July, 1784, p. 400, has the following item: "July 17. The American Aerostatic balloon will rise from New Workhouse yard with a person in it, between the hours of five and seven o'clock this evening".

<sup>12</sup> Letter in the collection of Edward Hopkinson, Esq. Dr. John Jeffries, A. B. Harvard 1763, M. D. Aberdeen 1769, was a Son of Liberty in the latter year but in 1776 went to Nova Scotia with Howe's troops as a surgeon, and thence to England. He returned to Boston in 1789 and practised medicine there until his death in 1819. Inflammable air is hydrogen.

<sup>13</sup> *Writings*, ed. Ford, IV. 60.

<sup>14</sup> *Works*, ed. Washington, I. 441.



Here then we have further evidence of the fact that the founders of the American nation were not merely provincial political leaders. Many of them, and particularly the three mentioned in this article, were men of great versatility and wide information, who found time, among the thronging cares of their active lives, to keep themselves well informed of the progress of art, letters, and science, not only here in America, but throughout Europe as well.

GEORGE E. HASTINGS.

#### THE COLLECTION OF STATE WAR SERVICE RECORDS

SINCE the United States entered the war a constantly growing number of states have officially recognized the importance of collecting and preserving the records of state and local participation in the World War. Scarcely a state in the Union but has felt the impulse of the general movement in which this recognition has found expression. Information now at hand indicates that central governments or governmental agencies in at least thirty-five states have made special and more or less adequate provision for the conduct, generally by men with the requisite training or aptitudes, of systematic and state-wide campaigns for the acquisition of all available records of the war services performed by their several commonwealths.<sup>1</sup>

In many instances the state council of defense, or corresponding body, acting upon its own initiative or in response to suggestions made early in the war by the National Board for Historical Service or, as frequently happened, at the instance and with the close co-operation of the leading state historical agency, inaugurated a local movement on the scale indicated through the appointment for the purpose of a "war history committee", a "state historian", a "war records commission", or similar agency.<sup>2</sup> In a smaller number of

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted at the outset that while a few of the states not included in this category are known to have done nothing noteworthy in this field, there are others which may have taken measures of which the writer is not aware.

<sup>2</sup> State councils of defense in California, Connecticut, Illinois, and Oklahoma assigned the work to a War History Committee; in North Carolina and Wyoming, to an Historical Committee; in Maryland, to an Historical Division; in New Mexico, to a Board of Historical Service; in Idaho, to the Woman's Committee; in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Oregon, and Rhode Island, to a state historian; in Michigan, to a State Director to Compile a Record of Michigan Soldiers and Sailors in the Great War; in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, to a War History Commission; and in Minnesota, to a War Records Commission. These agencies have been severally affiliated with the California Historical Survey Commission, the Connecticut State Library, the Illinois State Historical Library,

states, established historical institutions undertook similar tasks through an extension of their normal activities,<sup>3</sup> while in other states various agencies, including an executive commission, a state university, and a state library, took charge.<sup>4</sup> Many of these agencies were created or developed more or less provisionally under stress of war-time conditions, and as none of them, even of those first in the field, can yet have fully accomplished its enormous task, it is gratifying to note that at least eighteen of the state legislatures in session this year have made more or less permanent and substantial provision for the continuation and completion of the work in their several jurisdictions.<sup>5</sup>

the North Carolina Historical Commission, the Museum of New Mexico, the Alabama Department of Archives and History, the Oregon State Library, the Rhode Island State Library, the Michigan Historical Commission, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and the Minnesota Historical Society. State council of defense agencies in Kentucky, Maryland, and Michigan are known to be active as originally constituted, while the work of others presumably continues under the same auspices or as indicated below.

<sup>3</sup> Among these may be noted the Arkansas History Commission, the State Historical and Natural History Society of Colorado, the Indiana Historical Commission, the State Historical Society and the Historical Department of Iowa, the Mississippi State Department of Archives and History, the State Historical Society of Missouri, the Nebraska State Historical Society, and the Virginia Historical Society. It need scarcely be remarked that every active state historical agency, whether acting alone or in conjunction with a specially constituted war records body, in the ordinary course of events received current material during the war which in many instances forms the real nucleus of the state war records collection.

<sup>4</sup> Ohio has an Historical Commission appointed by the governor and affiliated with the State Archaeological and Historical Society and the State University, while the University of Texas and the New York State Library have taken the initiative in their respective fields, the former having established a separate department known as the Texas War Records Collection.

<sup>5</sup> Agencies known to be operating under some form of direct legislative authorization (appropriations for war records work, where known, being noted in parentheses) include the California Historical Survey Commission, the State Historical and Natural History Society of Colorado (\$5,000), the Department of War Records of the Connecticut State Library (\$10,000), the Illinois State Historical Library (\$20,000), the Indiana Historical Commission (\$20,000), the Iowa War Roster Commission (\$20,000), the adjutant general of Massachusetts, the Michigan Historical Commission, the Minnesota War Records Commission (\$10,000), the War History Bureau of the New Jersey State Library (\$10,000), the adjutant general of Nebraska (\$25,000), the North Dakota War History Commission (\$2,500), the Nevada Historical Society, the state historian and the adjutant general of New York, the adjutant general of Ohio (\$50,000), the state historian of Oregon (\$2,500), the North Carolina Historical Commission, and the Wisconsin War History Commission (\$37,500). In Michigan, funds made available by the War Preparedness Board, the legislature, and the Historical Commission,

To fulfill its mission completely, the war history commission or the state historian, as the case may be, must look for the assistance of public-spirited citizens in every community throughout the state. State-wide volunteer organizations have therefore been effected in Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, and Wisconsin, and have reached various stages of completion in Illinois, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and other states. The usual procedure is for the state body to appoint committees or representatives in all of the counties and towns to collect the records of their several communities. Where the committee plan is adopted, it is generally found necessary or advisable to form special county organizations of a thoroughly representative and distinctive character, but in many instances, notably in Indiana, Michigan, and New York, existing organizations and institutions, such as county councils of defense, historical societies, and libraries, have assumed the responsibility for their several districts. In Mississippi, the necessary local auxiliaries have been provided through the formation, primarily for this purpose, of an organization known as the Great War Veterans Association. In Michigan, Mississippi, North Carolina and, to some extent, in New York and Oregon, expenses of the local organizations are defrayed by the central body, but more commonly these are met with funds obtained from various local sources, county committees in Indiana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, for example, having received local financial assistance in amounts ranging from \$50 to \$1,000.<sup>6</sup> Material collected by the local committees is generally assembled at state headquarters and filed in a single central depository, though in some states, including Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, the plan is to build up both state and

total \$45,000. In Ohio, the legislature has authorized the addition of two new members to the staff of the State Archaeological and Historical Society in order further to facilitate the work carried on under the direction of the Historical Commission. In this connection it may also be noted that the work in Texas has been financed by the state university at the rate of \$12,500 a year, though \$5,000 of this has been devoted to the acquisition of general war history material. As will appear later in this article, in all instances here noted, with the exception of Texas, appropriations in excess of \$10,000 are intended to include some part or all of the cost of publishing histories or rosters.

<sup>6</sup> In Indiana, county boards of commissioners, under the specific authorization of the State Board of Accounts, may expend sums ranging from \$100 to \$1,000 in aid of the work of the war history committees of their several counties. In Minnesota, under the provisions of a new law, county boards and other local governing bodies may appropriate for similar purposes funds ranging in amount from \$250 in the case of villages and \$1,000 in the case of counties to \$5,000 in the case of cities of the first class.

county collections, the latter being housed for the time being at least in leading county libraries, courthouses, or other local depositories.

Generally speaking, the object of the war records organization is to collect and preserve all available material, of whatever variety of origin, content, or form, which in any way relates to the war services performed, individually and collectively, at home and abroad, by the citizens of the state, and to the altered course of life in the home community during the war period.

The desired material may be variously classified and described, but for the present purpose it may suffice to note two broad classes, distinguishable as compilations, or "made-to-order" records, and current material, or "ready-made" records. Compilations are generally regarded as the more important for the history of individuals, though supplementary matter, such as photographs, diaries, and letters, is always sought. Nearly every active state has prepared and distributed blank forms, or questionnaires, for the purpose of obtaining from various available sources of information the service records of soldiers, sailors, and marines. The general form is sometimes supplemented, as in Iowa, Maryland, and North Carolina, with one or more forms applicable particularly to those who were wounded or who lost their lives in the service. In Connecticut, a separate form is provided for the records of Red Cross nurses, chaplains, correspondents, and others who served in association with the armed forces of the nation. One of several forms used in Texas is intended to record the war services of agricultural producers. In a few states the practice of making compilations is extended to include activities other than those of individuals. For example, Connecticut uses a form for compiling service records of organizations; Texas provides blanks for the records of mercantile establishments and of industrial plants; and California is compiling information on various subjects through reports prepared by local representatives in accordance with certain general specifications.

For the history of organized or group activities, however, more or less special emphasis is usually placed upon the importance of collecting "ready-made" records, or the sort of material which was produced in connection with the actual conduct of the activities in question and has only to be gathered and preserved. In a number of states, including Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio, and Texas, more than usual care has been taken to make clear to the lay worker and to the general public the historical value of such products of the times as files of local newspapers; printed matter, such as pamphlets, programmes, and posters; manuscript material, such as min-

utes of proceedings, correspondence files, and official reports; pictorial records, such as photographs, motion-picture films, sketches, and maps; and mementoes or museum material, such as badges, flags, trophies, and relics. In Ohio, New Jersey, Missouri, and some other states, the compilation of records of individual military service appears to have been undertaken independently by the adjutant general's office, thus leaving the war records body free to devote more attention to the gathering of other war history material.

A few of the more general methods of collecting this material may be noted. Measures taken by the state bodies to arouse and maintain the interest of local representatives include the publication of bulletins outlining the nature and purpose of the work;<sup>7</sup> the sending out of series of vigorously worded and fully explanatory circular letters, as in Oregon; tours of the counties by field agents, as in Michigan; and the offering of prizes for the best collections, as in Mississippi. For the acquisition of important records of statewide interest, a thoroughgoing canvass of the state headquarters of all war organizations and of sources of information outside of the state is usually made by the central body. Sometimes a part of the whole task of the war records organization is assigned to an auxiliary agency, as in Texas, where the Daughters of the Confederacy have taken over the work of compiling the military and naval records. In all cases the active co-operation of established organizations and institutions and of the newly formed veterans' associations is earnestly sought. Extensive use is always made of the press and of other mediums of publicity. In Kentucky, for ex-

<sup>7</sup> Among bulletins and leaflets issued for this purpose and for the instruction of the general public, may be noted: *California in the War*, by the War History Committee of the California Council of Defense; *War History Committee (Bulletins, no. 34A)*, by the Illinois State Council of Defense; *Collection and Preservation of the Materials of War History (Bulletin of Information Series, no. 8)*, by the State Historical Society of Iowa; *A Statewide Movement to make a Record of Kentucky's Part in the World War*, by the Kentucky Council of Defense; *A Statewide Movement for the Collection and Preservation of Minnesota's War Records (Bulletins, no. 1)*, by the Minnesota War Records Commission; *The Great War Veterans Association of Mississippi (Bulletins, no. 2)*, by the Mississippi State Department of Archives and History; *The North Carolina Council of Defense: Historical Committee*, by the body of that name; *What are You Doing to Help Ohio Preserve her War Records?*, by the Historical Commission of Ohio; *Outline of Purpose and Scope and Subject-Matter for Pennsylvania War History Commission*, by the body of that name; *Directions for Organizing War History Committees and Collecting Material (Bulletins, no. 1)*, by the University of Texas; and *Collect Material for Wisconsin's War History Now, Directions for Organizing War History Committees and Collecting Material, and Some Further Suggestions concerning the Collection of County War History Material (Bulletins, nos. 1, 2, and 3)*, by the Wisconsin War History Commission.

ample, newspapers in all parts of the state were recently asked to join in an "historical drive" to stimulate collection through the publication of local war history material already secured or sought out specially for the purpose. Exhibits of war posters, photographs, soldiers' letters, miscellaneous ephemera, and relics, such as those on display in the state libraries and museums of Wisconsin, North Carolina, Minnesota, and Nebraska, help to accomplish a similar end. In all this, it may be remarked, the state war records bodies usually recognize as they are able the various special interests in the several states of agencies doing similar work in wider fields, such as the Army War College, the National Catholic War Council, the American Jewish Committee, the Navy League of the United States, and the Bibliothèque-Musée de la Guerre of Paris.

From all accounts it appears that the work is now well under way in most of the active states. In the compilation of lists and records of men in the service, and particularly of those killed, wounded, or cited for bravery, notable progress appears to have been made in California, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Virginia, and other states especially active in this direction.<sup>8</sup> Growing collections of soldiers' photographs, as in New Mexico; of soldiers' letters, as in Minnesota; of war posters, as in Wisconsin; and of records of local activities and conditions, as in Ohio, may be found everywhere. Maryland reports considerable progress made in gathering material relating to camps, military units, and non-military war agencies. Recent advices from Indiana and Texas indicate that marked success has attended the efforts of the war records bodies in those states to secure the custody of the state headquarters files of the leading war organizations, the Texas War Records Collection, for example, having some time ago received twelve large boxes of material, including original correspondence, from the Liberty Loan organization alone.

While the immediate object of the war records organizations is the collection of material, more or less definite plans have been made for the publication during the next few years of rosters and histories. In a number of states, including Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, and Ohio, provision has been made for the compilation and publication of rosters under the direction of the

<sup>8</sup> In this connection may be noted an act of Congress, approved July 11, 1919 (H. R. 5227), making funds "available for the employment of clerical help required to furnish to the Adjutants General of the several States statements of service of all persons from those States who entered the military service during the war with Germany".

several adjutants general, the sum of \$50,000 having been appropriated for this purpose in Ohio. Iowa and Minnesota have published tentative plans for comprehensive state war histories,<sup>9</sup> and similar works are projected in Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, and North Carolina. The legislatures of Wisconsin and Michigan have appropriated \$17,500 and \$10,000, respectively, for the publication of a history of the Thirty-second Division, which was made up largely of Wisconsin and Michigan national guardsmen. In a number of states, including Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, some of the local war records committees are planning to publish county war histories. As aids to such committees as well as to those which confine their efforts to the collection of material, the state agencies of Indiana and Iowa have published tentative outlines intended to suggest in their logical relationships "the various phases of local activities which were a part of the war history of the community during the World War".<sup>10</sup>

FRANKLIN F. HOLBROOK.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *Shall the Story of Iowa's Part in the War be Preserved?* (Iowa and War, January, 1919), by the State Historical Society of Iowa; *Minnesota's Part in the War: Shall it be Adequately Recorded?* (Bulletins, no. 2), by the Minnesota War Records Commission.

<sup>10</sup> *County War History Prospectus* (Bulletins, no. 10, War History Bulletins, no. 2), by the Indiana Historical Commission; *Tentative Outline for a County War History* (Iowa and War, February, 1919), by the State Historical Society of Iowa. In some states, particularly in the Middle West, many projects for the publication of county war histories, so-called and otherwise, have been initiated independently of the war records organizations by private, but for the most part resident, publishers. Generally speaking, the official state agencies take a friendly attitude toward the publication of *bona fide* histories prepared chiefly under local auspices and as community ventures, but disapprove of projects, usually those of outside publishing firms, which are primarily commercial in character and intended for purposes of exploitation.

<sup>11</sup> [See also note on pp. 149-150. Ed.]



## DOCUMENTS

### *Letter of David Colden, Loyalist, 1783*

DAVID COLDEN, the writer of this letter, was the son of Cadwallader Colden, lieutenant-governor of New York, and his wife, Alice Christy, and was born November 23, 1733. He married, February 27, 1767, Ann, the daughter of his neighbor, John Willet, of Flushing, Long Island, and inherited his father's estate at Springhill, near Flushing, where this letter was written.

Although educated for the profession of physician, David Colden never practised medicine, except privately for the benefit of his friends and neighbors. Much of this worthy Loyalist's time was spent in various scientific pursuits, and among his correspondents on philosophical and other subjects was Dr. Franklin. In appreciation of his services as a Loyalist he was, on July 15, 1780, appointed assistant master of the rolls and superintendent of the police on Long Island. In 1784, David Colden went to England to seek compensation for the loss of his real property, confiscated by the New York legislature, and George Duncan Ludlow, the trustee of his children, was awarded by the British government the sum of £2,720 sterling from the claim of £10,282:15:0.<sup>1</sup>

David Colden died in London, July 10, 1784, his death having been hastened by his misfortunes in America, and was buried in the graveyard of St. Anne's Church, Soho. He left a widow and several children, who were sheltered by his brother, Cadwallader Colden, likewise a Loyalist, at Coldenham, N. Y.

Cadwallader, born April 4, 1769, the elder son of David Colden, accompanied his father into exile in England, where he was partially educated under the charge of his maternal uncle, Colonel Farrington, of the Royal Artillery. Under the care of his guardian, George Duncan Ludlow, he was taken at the age of sixteen to Canada, and was articled to the well-known Loyalist lawyer, William Wyly. After a brief sojourn in Canada, Cadwallader Colden removed to New York, and would seem to have entered the office of Richard Harrison, a lawyer and attorney, in January, 1791. His subsequent career as an eminent lawyer, as colonel of a regiment of volunteers in the War of 1812, as a member of the assembly of

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, London, A. O. 12:109.

New York, as mayor of the city, and as a congressman and state senator, are too familiar for detailed recapitulation here. His name is associated with the New York Historical Society by the presentation of the Colden papers to that society by Mrs. Frances Colden, the widow of his eldest son, Cadwallader.<sup>2</sup>

The accompanying letter,<sup>3</sup> now published it is believed for the first time, was written by David Colden to his niece, Mrs. Henrietta Maria Colden, a Scottish lady, whose maiden name was Bethune. She had married Richard Nicholls Colden, the writer's nephew, who was surveyor and searcher of the port of New York, and who died in 1777. Her two sons, Alexander and Cadwallader, were being educated in 1784 at a school near Lancaster in England, and the British government allowed her £ 50 per annum for their education. When giving evidence in support of her claim for the loss of her deceased husband's property in America, Mrs. Henrietta Maria Colden impressed the commissioners of American claims in London by her good sense and competence.

E. ALFRED JONES.

SPRING HILL 15th September 1783

*Dear Madam:*

I am sorry to have been in any degree accessory to the painful anxiety under which you waited six months, expecting a letter from me. I hope one I wrote in April, would reach your hands in a few weeks after the date of your last to me, of the 30th of the same month. You would, however, even then, receive little satisfaction from my letter, respecting your affairs in this country; but it might convince you that I do not forget you. Be assured I would write oftener, if I could ever communicate any thing, either new or satisfactory to you about your affairs. I did not know but Mr. Auchmuty<sup>4</sup> might manage better for you than I could. He has however obtained nothing from Antill,<sup>5</sup> who keeps

<sup>2</sup> For the Colden family, see the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record*, IV. 161-183; and Public Record Office, London, A. O. 12: 14; A. O. 12: 9; A. O. 12: 25; A. O. 12: 101; A. O. 12: 109; A. O. 13: 12; A. O. 13: 64; A. O. 13: 97; A. O. 13: 137.

<sup>3</sup> Public Record Office, London, A. O. 13: 97.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Nichols Auchmuty, Loyalist, son of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Auchmuty, rector of Trinity Church, New York City.

<sup>5</sup> Maj. John Antill, a lawyer, son of Hon. Edward Antill, of Perth Amboy, N. J., where he held several public appointments before the Revolutionary War. With his brother-in-law, Lieut.-Col. John Morris, of Shrewsbury, N. J., he was instrumental in raising in 1776 the second battalion of the well-known Loyalist regiment, the New Jersey Volunteers. On August 15, 1780, he was cashiered for making false returns and drawing provisions for more men than the effective strength of his battalion, but was shortly afterward reinstated. Major Antill married (1) April 21, 1770, Margaret, daughter of Alexander and Elizabeth (Nicholls) Colden of New York; and (2) his deceased wife's sister, Jane Colden,

possession of the Brooklyn Estate. Nothing can be got from him but by selling the few necessaries his wife and children have left. His half pay feeds them from day to day, and no more. Auchmuty tells me he is convinced this is their situation, and declines commencing a suit, that must be ineffectual. I do not know why he does not write to you.

Antill has been several months of this summer in Nova Scotia, looking out for a settlement there. He returned lately; and is now going, with his son Jack, to England, upon what scheme I know not: nor in what manner he intends to provide for his wife and children, whom he leaves here.

Your letter to John Laurence<sup>6</sup> was put into the hands of a gentleman, who engaged to deliver it to him in a few days. I am informed Mr. Laurence supports a favorable character—is pushing himself forward, and bids fair to rise in his profession. He has been two or three times in New York, since the cessation of hostilities, but I have not seen him. He will probably be a useful man to you. He designs to settle in New York.

The legislature of this State have not passed any act, immediately affecting the title of any part of the estate belonging to you or your children. No act of theirs yet passed, mentions your husband's estate, his fathers or his grandfather Colden's, either directly or by implication. That part of my fathers estate only, which belongs to me, is involved as being part of mine. But as you desire me to give you the most particular information of any act passed that may affect you, I will transcribe abstracts of some clauses of the act of attainder, passed in 1779,<sup>7</sup> which renders every man's estate who was within the British lines at any time of the war, liable to be yet involved in the destruction it works.—It is enacted that, the Grand Jurors at any Supreme Court of Judicature, Oyer and Terminer or General Joal Delivery, to be held in and for any county of this state, on oath of any one or more creditable witness, that

who were sisters of Richard Nicholls Colden, the husband of the lady to whom this letter was written. Allusion is made in this letter to Major Antill's visit to Nova Scotia, whither he had gone, with Lieut.-Col. Elisha Lawrence, of the New Jersey Volunteers, as the accredited agents of the seconded officers of the Loyalist regiments to secure settlements for them in that province. Parr, the governor of Nova Scotia, in a letter of August 15, 1783, to General Sir Guy Carleton, complains of Major Antill's "unreasonable demands and illiberal ideas on the part of the second officers"; to which the general replied on September 5, regretting that the seconded officers had "made choice of so improper a person as Major Antill to act as their agent". Historical MSS. Commission, *Report on the American MSS. in the Royal Institution*, IV. 60, 280, 334; Public Record Office, London, A. O. 12: 14; A. O. 12: 100; A. O. 13: 93; A. O. 13: 108; A. O. 13: 113. For the loss of his property in New Jersey he made a claim, and was awarded by the British government the sum of £2,900, as well as \$340 for the loss of his annual professional income. In addition to these allowances, Major Antill was granted a pension and half-pay as major. A. O. 12: 109.

<sup>6</sup> John Lawrence was perhaps the Loyalist physician of that name, who was the son of John Lawrence of New Jersey, an ardent Loyalist, and brother of Lieut.-Col. Elisha Lawrence, mentioned in foot-note 5. Dr. John Lawrence was educated at the College of New Jersey and practised medicine at New York during the Revolutionary War. Sabine's *American Loyalists*.

<sup>7</sup> *Laws of the State of New York* (Albany, 1886), vol. I. (1777–1784), pp. 173–184.

any person, whether in full life or *deceased*, has been guilty of the offence aforesaid (adhering to the enemy) shall prefer bills of inditements against such persons.—Sheriffs are to give notice of the inditements by publishing advertisements,—and it is then enacted that, on neglect to appear and traverse the inditement, agreeable to the sheriff's notice, the several persons charged in such inditement whether in full life or *deceased* to be adjudged guilty and forfeit all and singular their estate real and personal.—In case a person *deceased* is indited his representative is to appear and traverse.—Some hundred Freeholders, Merchants and Inhabitants of Long Island, New York and Staaten Island have been indited, under this Act, since the cessation of hostilities. So little effect have the preliminary articles yet had!—I do not know that they have proceeded against any person not in full life, altho' they might under this very extraordinary act, declared by the preamble to be made in order to work a confiscation of estates for the use of the State.—Tyrannical Law! made to take a man's life for the express purpose of getting his estate. Be not surprised at the warmth of my expressions; it affects me to the quick. But you wish to have me say what predicament I think your children's estate stands in. I believe it safe from confiscation. The law is too severe to be continued. Hitherto it has lain unnoticed. It must now be animadverted upon, and stigmatised with such censure by the world, that for the credit of a national character, it must be blotted out. I believe there is a tax laid upon all uncultivated lands; if it is so your son's estate cannot be exempted from the effects of such a law; but what method is taken to get money for the tax, I am not informed.

McLean, the tenant your husband left on the farm near Newburgh, I hear is yet in possession of it: and Haasbrook, of the lands he rented.—The back rents, when they can be collected, must amount to something considerable.

I have to inform you of an addition to Sandy's estate that has not been adverted to till a few month's since. My sister Caty,<sup>8</sup> who died in 1762, by her will gave 2000 acres of land to Cad'r<sup>9</sup> son of her brother Alex'r, to Alex'r<sup>10</sup> son of her brother Cad'r and to Alice<sup>11</sup> daughter of her sister Alice (Willett) to be divided equally between them. In case of the death of the first named, under age or without issue, she gives his share to his brother Richard.<sup>12</sup> Cad'r died under age, so that both by will and descent this share now belongs to your Sandy. Then 2000 acres of land was granted to William Mitchell in trust for my sister, to whom he released them, by deeds bearing date 15th October 1761; they are distinguished by Lott M in Butlars Purchase, and Lotts No. 2,

<sup>8</sup> Catherine, daughter of Cadwallader and Alice (Christy) Colden, who was born February 13, 1731, and died in June, 1762, unmarried.

<sup>9</sup> Cadwallader, son of Alexander Colden, and his wife, Elizabeth Nicholls. Alexander was born August 13, 1716, and was surveyor-general of the province of New York jointly with his father, postmaster of New York, and a vestryman of Trinity Church, New York, from 1761 until his death.

<sup>10</sup> Alexander, son of Cadwallader Colden, the younger, and grandson of Lieut.-Gov. Cadwallader Colden. He married Gertrude (Wynkoop), widow of his brother David, and was a farmer at Coldenham, N. Y.

<sup>11</sup> Alice Willet was the daughter of Col. William Willet and his second wife, Alice, daughter of Lieut.-Gov. Cadwallader and Alice (Christy) Colden.

<sup>12</sup> Richard Nicholls Colden. See introductory note.

No. 8 and No. 28 in Glens Purchase, and are otherwise particularly described. They lie near the Mohawk River in Tryon County, in a pretty well settled part of the country, and are valuable. Caty's will is dated 16th May 1762; it was recorded and deposited in the Prerogative Office. I have an official copy of it, which I have now put up with the release from Mitchell, that I fortunately found among my papers, and have deposited them in a chest with my own papers of that kind, and those belonging to my Fathers Estate, which I have lodged in Mr. John Watts's house in New York.<sup>13</sup> A place where it is supposed there will be more security than here in the country. The mohagony box, with all the papers I received from you, my book of accounts with you, and whatever letters or papers have come to my hands relative to your affairs, put up in it, is included in the same chest with my papers, under Mr. Watts's care.

I have mentioned the back rents of the lands at Newburgh, and you will readily say, why is not something done to collect them now. To answer this question, I must endeavor to give you some idea of the state of this country, which will at the same time be answering some other queries in your letter.

We have pass'd a twelve month, in the most perplexing state of uncertainty that ever a people did. Long waiting for the portionary articles, expecting they would certainly provide some security for the unfortunate loyalists, they have only increased our distress and cause of anxiety, and to this hour we do not know that they will have the smallest effect in our favour. No measures have yet been taken by Congress, except the release of prisoners, or by any of the states, that we know of, in consequence of the treaty. Even the recommendation of Congress, to which the English Ministry have devoted the lives and fortunes of thousands, whose virtuous attachment to Government shall render their characters immortal, while that of the ministers shall be execrated, I say, even this recommendation has not yet come forth. The spirit of persecution and violence against the unhappy loyalists does not appear to abate in any degree, since the cessation of hostilities. They are not suffered to go into the country even to take a last farewell of their relations. Committees are form'd throughout the country, who publish the most violent resolves against the loyalists, and give instructions to the legislative bodies, directly repugnant to the treaty. We are told that these committees have allarm'd the people in power, who wish to suppress them, but know not how. The people have been taught a dangerous truth, that *all power is derived from them*. Nothing can now render the country tolerably happy but the strength and firmness of the Governors: the Legislative Bodies; those in whom the Constitution have placed the Power of Governing. The most dreadfull anarchy must ensue, should the new Government prove unequal to the Task. An event most devoutly to be deprecated by every good Man! The Legislature of the State of New York have not been convened since the preliminary Treaty came [over?]. It is said, that by the Constitution, Peace having taken place, they cannot meet till representatives are elected for Long Island and that part of the state that has been within the British Lines. The election cannot be made while the British Army is here. General

<sup>13</sup> John Watts, senior and junior, prominent in the commercial and social history of the city of New York, both of whom were Loyalists. Sabine, *American Loyalists*.

Charlton<sup>14</sup> has informed Congress by letter of the 17th of last month, that he has received the Kings orders for the final evacuati[on] of New York, but that the infractions of the Treaty, and violences committed in the country upon the loyalists, has driven such multitudes of them to apply to him to be removed to some place of security, that he cannot say when he shall be able to leave the place being determind not to leave any loyalist behind, who chos[es] to go away. Above 30,000 men women and children, have already been transported to Nova Scotia etc. and a very large number are still waiting for ships to carry them. Many substantial farmers of Long Island, and inhabitants of New York are gone and going, freightend away by inditements, and menaces, the fear of taxes, and an abhorrence of a republican government.

What I have now written will be sufficient to convince you that this country is by no means yet in such a situation, that private affairs can be lookd into and settled.

You must allow my dear Niece that if I do not write frequently, you get very long epistles from me. The present has got to an enormous length, and yet I have said very little of the friends you inquire after. This will fill every corner of my paper. I have nothing to add to what I have already said of Antill and his family. Hamilton<sup>15</sup> says he will abide on his farm in my neighborhood with his children. It is generally thought that he will be made very unhappy, as soon as the British army leaves us, and that he had much better go to some other place. My sister Delancey<sup>16</sup> has had many severe tryals to encounter. Her son James<sup>17</sup> included in the same act of attainder with me, has no expectation of recovering his estate: he is gone to England. She has parted with him, never expecting to see him again. Her daughter Barclay<sup>18</sup> is gone with her husband and four children to Nova Scotia, where they must be reduced to a kind of life neither of them have ever before been

<sup>14</sup> Gen. Sir Guy Carleton, who was appointed commander-in-chief of the British army in North America, in succession to Gen. Sir Henry Clinton, on February 23, 1782.

<sup>15</sup> Col. Archibald Hamilton, who after twenty-seven years' service as an officer in the British army in Flanders, North America, and the West Indies, retired and bought a farm at Flushing, Long Island, where he became colonel of the Queens County militia. He married Alice, daughter of Alexander and Elizabeth (Nicholls) Colden, on July 16, 1766; she died during the Revolutionary War, and he died an exile at Edinburgh, Scotland, on June 1, 1795. His only son, Alexander Mark Kerr Hamilton, rose to be a major-general in the British army, of whom a biography is in preparation by the writer of these notes.

<sup>16</sup> Elizabeth Colden married Peter DeLancey of New York (1705-1770). T. Jones, *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, I. 649-663. In her original letter to Maj.-Gen. James Robertson, dated August 5, 1782, she refers to the fact that early in the war her house at Westchester was taken possession of by the Continentals and converted into a military hospital. Later, when the Continentals were routed, her house became the headquarters of General Heister, in command of German troops, who appears to have commandeered all Mrs. DeLancey's forage, grain, and cattle, without payment. Hist. MSS. Comm., *Rept. on the Amer. MSS. in the Royal Inst.*, III. 54-55.

<sup>17</sup> Col. James DeLancey, son of Peter and Elizabeth (Colden) DeLancey, was colonel of the Westchester Refugees, province of New York—a Loyalist corps.

<sup>18</sup> Susannah DeLancey, who married the eminent Loyalist, Major Thomas H. Barclay.



acquainted with. The half pay allowed them will make their situation tolerable, which I apprehend would otherwise have been much otherwise. Her son Stephen<sup>19</sup> lately sailed with his wife and four children for Quebec, to look out for the means of living when he gets there. Her son Oliver<sup>20</sup> has been turned off of the old family estate at West Chester since the cessation of hostilities, by commissioners acting under authority of the state, who gave him and several others a severe whipping, lest they should forget the Orders they had got to remove. Oliver had given his Mother a great deal of uneasiness not long before by a most foolish and disagreeable marriage. My sister herself was threatened with the loss of her estate at West Chester, Union Hall,<sup>21</sup> and to secure it has been obliged to remove there with her Daughter Nancy.<sup>22</sup> It is a most horrid place to be in at present. They have been very quiet since they got there, now about three weeks, under the protection of some of the American Army who are stationed there to curb the lawless Banditti who had got possession of the Country. Her son John<sup>23</sup> is in New York, but I imagine he will not remain behind the British Army. Warner you recollect is in the 17th Dragoons.<sup>24</sup> My brother Cad'r<sup>25</sup> is in New York, his wife and family returned to his estate at Coldingham<sup>26</sup> after the peace, where they were well received and have met with no disturbance. He cannot go home himself to [till] the banishing act is repealed, and is advised to go out of the way, somewhere, when the evacuation takes place, till the act is repealed. His son Thomas<sup>27</sup> and his wife intended going to Nova Scotia, with the Regt. who sailed a few days since, but Thom has been ill, and is not sufficiently recovered to undertake the voyage, and the difficulties they must encounter, not having the least corner prepared, or a spot of cleared ground, where they are going. Capt. Willett<sup>28</sup> has got leave to go to England.

<sup>19</sup> Stephen DeLancey, a lawyer, and recorder of Albany and clerk of Tryon county, N. Y.

<sup>20</sup> Oliver DeLancey, a lieutenant in the royal navy, but resigned because he would not fight against his native land, America, in the Revolutionary War. The "foolish and disagreeable marriage" was presumably to Rachel Hunt, of West Farms, Westchester county.

<sup>21</sup> Union Hill, West Farms, Westchester county.

<sup>22</sup> Nancy DeLancey is not named in her mother's will.

<sup>23</sup> John DeLancey, an officer in the British army.

<sup>24</sup> Warren DeLancey, a cornet in the 17th Dragoons.

<sup>25</sup> Cadwallader Colden, son of Lieut.-Gov. Cadwallader Colden and his wife, Alice Christy. He was born in New York, May 26, 1722, and married in 1745-6 Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Ellison, of New Windsor, N. Y. He died at Coldenham, Orange county, N. Y., on February 18, 1797.

<sup>26</sup> Coldenham. See foot-notes 10, 25.

<sup>27</sup> Thomas, son of the above Cadwallader and Elizabeth (Ellison) Colden, was born in 1754 and married February 16, 1781, Anne, daughter of William and Alice (Colden) Willet. During the Revolution he served as an officer in the New Jersey Volunteers and the Pennsylvania Loyalists, being a major on half-pay until his death, March 30, 1826, at New York.

<sup>28</sup> Capt. Gilbert Colden Willet of the 2nd battalion of DeLancey's Brigade, son of Col. William Willet and his second wife, Alice, daughter of Lieut.-Gov. Cadwallader and Alice (Christy) Colden. He married Susan, daughter of Robert Murray, of New York, and was a vestryman of St. Mark's Church in that city in 1799.



Now for myself, here am I, condemn'd to suffer death, if ever I am found in the State of New York; and yet my determination is to put them to the test. They have condemn'd me, while living at my usual place of residence, without calling on me to appear and take a tryal. I am not guilty of the treason alledged against me. My going or staying will not I conceive affect the recovery of my estate. If they are determined to have it, they surely will let me off with my life at any time. My family will be inerted [?] in certain distress if I leave them, which they may escape if I stay with them. This, and a consciousness of innocence, determines my present resolution to keep possession of that part of my estate where I lived before and during the war.

I am glad to close this gloomy letter with a subject of another kind, the marriage of one of your connections. Rich'd Harrison<sup>29</sup> was married last week to Miss Ludlow, eldest daughter of the Judge; she went to England in June. I am happy to hear of the progress your sons make in their learning. My wife and children join in very affectionate remembrance of you and them. Please to present my respectfull compliments to your father, and do not forget to give me credit for the length of my letters, tho' you cannot for their frequency. Let me stand credited likewise for being

Dear Niece

Your affec't Uncle and most humble Serv't

DAVID COLDEN.

To Mrs. Henrietta Colden  
Isle of Man.

<sup>29</sup> Richard Harrison, a lawyer and member of the New York bar, who married Frances, daughter of George Duncan Ludlow, the Loyalist, afterwards chief justice of New Brunswick. Cadwallader Colden, the eldest son of David Colden, the writer of this letter, commenced the study of law in the office of Richard Harrison upon his return from England in 1785.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*The Baronial Opposition to Edward II., its Character and Policy: a Study in Administrative History.* By JAMES CONWAY DAVIES, Emmanuel College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1918. Pp. x, 644. \$4.00.)

BISHOP STUBBS's opinion of the reign of Edward II. was that it was an age when the public life of England stood at a very low level, and most readers feel that it is one of the most dreary of historical periods. Nothing has been done since Stubbs wrote to modify that particular opinion, but much has been recently done to show that the reign is more important in the constitutional history of England than we formerly supposed. This is especially true of the work of Professor Tout; and now Mr. Davies has published a minute study of most of the reign, showing similar conclusions. These studies are peculiarly welcome because they concern the differentiation, of which we know almost nothing, of administrative institutions from feudal forms of government. The process, as a differentiation, is made to stand out clearly by Mr. Davies.

His book in general is one to be grateful for, though it is not easy reading. It attends strictly to business and eschews all graces, and even sometimes carefulness, of expression. His main thesis is that the barons, recognizing the importance of the administrative system, tried to get control of it in order to control the government. His method is to take up one administrative institution after another, to state one after another his conclusions regarding it and its operation, and to illustrate each point with numerous detailed instances. Mr. Davies has subjected the records of the reign, the "Rolls" of all kinds, to a minuteness of search which is impressive but seems sometimes too fully reproduced for the reader. The result is, however, that much new light is thrown on the operation of government and also upon facts not particularly noted or in the intention of the author. He shows for example how Edward got business done which he did not wish to do himself, and gives us the impression that the king did more of the work of his office than we had thought. The royal prerogative, the position of the earl, the serjeanty tenure as the feudal endowment of administration (not quite so logically developed as it should be), the work of the executive and the use of the seals, the chamber as a financial institution, the work of the household and the transformation of its great offices into empty titles, chancery and exchequer, and many other topics receive full illustration.

Although the process going on in the reign is constantly referred to as one of differentiation, the necessary unconsciousness of this fact on the

part of those carrying it on seems to be overlooked, and with it the hold which the old ideas would have over their minds. This is particularly true with regard to the "curious combination of council and parliament" (p. 291) and to the relation of exchequer and chancery to the council. To the men of the time the process was not one of confusion (p. 290). The confusion is ours because we cannot get clearly into our minds all that is involved in the differentiation. The author's facts show Parliament and council growing more apart, but the differentiation still incomplete, as we should expect. If Mr. Davies intends to imply (pp. 291-293) that the name Parliament was then restricted to meetings in which the new representative elements were present, the fact would be surprising, but he is probably only making a distinction of his own. It is also not to be thought strange that exchequer and chancery still occasionally act as council; it would be strange if at that date they had not now and then done so.

It must not be inferred that the book deals with institutional details only. It states clearly the constitutional significance of the age and strongly supports past conclusions as to its contribution to this side of things. Indeed Mr. Davies shows more fully than has been done before how the opposition carries forward the tradition begun by Magna Carta. In his interpretation of the fundamental principles of the Great Charter and of the details of their development during the thirteenth century, his discussion is closely parallel to that of the reviewer's *Origin of the English Constitution*, though he does not refer to that book. He sums up in these words (p. 542):

The best that can be said of the baronial opposition in general is that it sought to subject the king, no less than his people, to the rule of law. The great principle contained in Magna Carta that the king was under the law, was very open to misinterpretation, and the policy of the barons partly laid them open to this charge. Viewed from the best light the aims of the opposition were to secure the omnipotence of law and to lessen the powers the king might exercise to the detriment, or in negation, of law.

G. B. ADAMS.

✓ *Isabel of Castile and the Making of the Spanish Nation, 1451-1504.*

By IERNE L. PLUNKET. [Heroes of the Nations.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1919. Pp. xi, 432. \$1.90.)

THIS is an exceedingly well-written book, and it comes as near to serious historical presentation as a work of a semi-popular character can do. The author's method of handling her subject inspires confidence, even though she refrains from the use of page citations and foot-notes. And, indeed, there are many lengthy and well-selected quotations from sources that are well-known to him who would even be critical in this field of history. Andres Bernaldez, Pulgar, Sabatini, Zurita, and Marineo Siculo form the basis of the work, and in thrilling parts even Prescott and Washington Irving are not excluded from quotation.

The work well belongs in the *Heroes of the Nations* series, for Isabel is the heroine of the story and Ferdinand plays the opposite part as king, husband, and even as villain. At times, however, the author draws the curtain aside and we see Isabel in a less sanctified garb, as for example:

It must not be inferred . . . that the Castilian princess had been endowed with a love of truth under any circumstances. Her life had been spent for the most part in an atmosphere of treachery, where he who was the least reliable or conscientious scored highest in the game of politics; and, when necessity forced her to play a hand as in the case of her marriage, she had proved herself capable of "bluffing" with the best. The threading of such intricate mazes was an ordinary statesman's career, and Isabel had been born with an aptitude for statecraft. What was worth a great deal more to Spain was her aptitude for kingship.

And from this book we realize more than ever that she was a wife and mother, with all the feelings, the disappointments and sufferings of one of that age; she was first and always queen and guiding spirit of Spain, and to these all other considerations were secondary.

The first three chapters of the book deal with the background of Isabella's reign. The institutions of early Spain, the kingship, the nobles, the municipalities, and the Church are seen in conflict, and through the chaos of this period the need of an organizer is evident. These conditions were especially aggravated by the misgovernment, anarchy, and civil war of the reign of Henry IV. (1454-1474), whose period was given over to dynastic quarrels and who was continually under the influence of political favorites, ambitious nobles, and belligerent churchmen. The most far-reaching event of this epoch was the betrothal and the final union of Ferdinand and Isabel. Some attention is also paid to the antecedents of Ferdinand, to Aragon's policy in Navarre, and to relations with France and Portugal.

The political events of Isabel's reign divide themselves, according to our author's argument, into three main divisions. We first note the culmination of Castile's policy in her triumph over Portugal and the ending of all hostility through the subsequent betrothal of the younger Isabel to Dom Affonso, heir to the Portuguese throne. At the same time, La Beltraneja, Isabel's only rival, was buried in a convent at Coimbra. Secondly, the combination of Isabel's strong passion for the political union of Spain under Castile and her love for the Catholic religion led to the Moorish wars. Considerable attention is given to these and the capture of Malaga and Granada. They are picturesquely described and add to the interest of the story.

After the Moorish wars come the Inquisition and the final expulsion of the Jews and the Mudéjares. The economic results of the expulsion are noticed, though hardly sufficiently. Ferdinand and Isabel needed money, after all their wars, and the Jews were not given time to get away with their wealth. The spot-light is rather focussed on the queen's religious devotion, and her gentle submission, during her later years

especially, to the gentle influence of the holy prelates, Mendoza, Talavera, and Cisneros, so that when "word was brought to the queen that trade was diminishing, yet she, esteeming little the loss of her revenues, and as great value the purity of her dominions, declared that, putting aside her own interests, she would seek to cleanse the land from the sin of heresy because she believed that she fulfilled God's service and her own". No particular comment is made on the fact that thus Isabel, who made Spain, at this moment started her downfall, depriving her of economic stability and her people of respect for industry, turning her over to the clergy who have continued to exploit her since. The advent of Columbus and the discovery of America are given their proper perspective in the larger study of Spain at the time of Isabel.

The third topic considered in this interesting sketch is the foreign policy of the Catholic monarchs, as shown, first, in their efforts to make Spain a world-power through the marriage alliance, and which succeeded in temporarily uniting Spain with Portugal, England, and Germany. The fact that this finally brought a Hapsburg ruler and a world-emperor to the Spanish throne is of course outside the scope of this book. The other direction of their foreign policy, or rather Ferdinand's, was in the Mediterranean, where he succeeded in outwitting France and bringing a large portion of Italy under his control, at the same time strengthening Spain's hold on the papacy. There are also chapters on Spanish literature and on the institutions and reforms inaugurated by Ferdinand and Isabella.

Possibly the most delightful feature of the book is its realistic portrayal of character. Especially is this to be appreciated in the chapters on the Church and Inquisition, where dry and forbidding prelates are shown quite intimately as human beings. It is indeed a service to the medieval period of Spanish history that someone has written a book which pulsates with human interest. There is nothing new in the volume; indeed there is much omitted; but it gives us again in live, interesting form, the story so entertainingly told by Prescott and Irving; and it is well re-told.

✓ *Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters.* Translated and Edited by PRESERVED SMITH and CHARLES M. JACOBS. Volume II., 1521-1530. (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society. 1918. Pp. 568. \$3.50.)

Six years ago (1913) Dr. Preserved Smith of Amherst College published the first volume of *Luther's Correspondence and other Contemporary Letters*, covering the period 1507-1521. He thereby performed a really invaluable service to every English-speaking student of general and church history, offering him for the first time in his vernacular the fundamental part of the history of the most momentous crisis in the annals of Europe as told by the participants and eye-witnesses themselves

in all the unreserve of private correspondence. Now the second volume has left the press. The labor of selection, translation, and editing is no longer in the hands of one man. More than half of this second volume is the work of the Rev. Professor Charles M. Jacobs of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Mt. Airy. This however by no means lessens the standard value of the work, as Charles Jacobs is well known as an entirely trustworthy translator of Luther and one of our best students of the history of the German Reformation; it rather guarantees a more rapid progress of the whole undertaking. The second volume extends over the years 1521-1530 and contains 399 pieces of Luther's correspondence and contemporary letters, nos. 478-875 of the whole work, together with two letters in the appendix. The principles of editing have justly remained the same; not only Luther's own letters are given but also the important ones addressed to him or treating of him. So we find letters of Emperor Charles V., King Henry VIII., Landgrave Philip of Hesse, George Duke of Saxony, the electors Frederick and John, Pope Adrian VI., Albert, cardinal archbishop of Mayence, Cardinal Wolsey, many letters of Erasmus, of Melancthon, etc. In selecting for this period the editors, of course, had to choose a much smaller proportion of the available letters than in the first volume, because the correspondence and influence of Luther between 1521 and 1530 had enormously widened and the remaining material is vastly larger. But the selection is made very wisely and circumspectly. It very seldom happens that a letter rightly expected is not reprinted. The translation is faithful and trustworthy. To give all necessary light for the comprehension of the text, foot-notes are added, containing explanations of allusions, corrections of mistakes, and short biographical notices of persons mentioned. Three appendixes offer unpublished texts (1, various readings of a letter of Henry VIII. to Luther; 2, a letter of Erasmus to Louis Ber; 3, a letter of Peter Albinianus Tretius to Luther), an excellent bibliography of epistles of dates contemporary with Luther, and errata and addenda. In the short introduction we take exception to the statement: "It seems that by a more liberal policy Erasmus might have been completely won." Here the authors fail to recognize the fundamental difference between Luther and Erasmus; Erasmus, in the last analysis, was morally and religiously a man of the Middle Ages while Luther ushered in the new era.

The work as a whole is an excellent "Enders" in English, though somewhat condensed, still in many ways supplemented and improved, a real credit to American scholarship.

M. REU.

✓ *Liverpool Town Books, Proceedings of Assemblies, Common Councils, Portmoot Courts, etc., 1550-1862. Volume I., 1550-1571.* Edited by J. A. TWEMLOW. (Liverpool: University Press; London: Constable and Company. 1918. Pp. ccxvi, 719.)

STUDENTS of Tudor history, who knew that Mr. Twemlow was at work preparing the earlier Town Books of the city of Liverpool for publication, must congratulate him on the appearance of his first ponderous volume. From the point of view of an accurate and complete text—which few can hope to equal—of elaborate annotations, of careful indexes covering names, subjects, places, and the long introduction, Mr. Twemlow's work completely supersedes all previous attempts to edit this particular manuscript whether in whole or in part.

For the city of Liverpool itself and in some degree for town life in Tudor England, the volume not only ought to be most useful but will help to correct errors in local and wider history. To the genealogist and philologist its value will be greater, and the editor has helped the latter with a glossary which in many places supplements and corrects the *New Oxford Dictionary*.

The manuscript consists of a record covering the years 1550-1571 and was compiled by Recorder Pendleton. It follows a somewhat monotonous round of elections of mayors and other civic officials, of civic portmoots, of admissions to freedom, of law cases, of parliamentary elections. Most valuable, however, for the student of bigger things is the light thrown on shipping, especially in connection with trade and military expeditions to Ireland, on prices, on trade regulations, on public morals. The appendixes, too, will prove serviceable in illustrating rentals and assessments and taxes.

On the whole, however, the volume is somewhat of a disappointment. Perhaps this is because we had hoped for too much. Intrinsically its value is rather severely local and these vital years of quick movements which left indelible marks on English history are made little clearer. Maybe we have exhausted the valuable records for them. Be that as it may, Recorder Pendleton could give regular records of the days and seasons, the weather and harvests, but could leave almost unnoticed—save for a fleeing priest, a new communion table, a record of the Great Pillage—the events which touched every hamlet and parish in England. Perhaps wisdom guided his pen, and discretion was the better part of his recusant or conformist valor, but the fact remains that the big currents of Tudor history receive little or no tributary waters from his record. It may be facetious, but I notice the famous "&c" in Elizabeth's title in the earliest mention of her reign in the manuscript.

In editorial work so minutely detailed and as a rule so accurate and far-reaching, it may be somewhat unkind to find faults. Mr. Twemlow has, I think, done his work in a manner which commands admiration. He has erred, however, in over-elaboration. The description of the



manuscript, inside and outside, while very interesting, is more suited for a local antiquarian magazine. The pages of his introduction which state the worth of local history and the necessity for the publication of local records are commonplace. Doubtless they may serve to spur on the city fathers of Liverpool to further munificence in helping such work, but they are too obvious in their point and ought not to have appeared. Again many of the notes are unnecessary. For example it is over-editing to tell us that Pendleton does not deserve the praise for handwriting and orderly record-keeping which was bestowed on a Nottingham town clerk at the close of the fifteenth century (p. cxii, note 1); or that a modern Spanish ship and a recently torpedoed Bilboa ship bear the name *Nuestra Señora de Begoña*, just because a ship called the *Sancta Maria debigonia* appears in the text (p. 302). Other and many such examples might be given, but these serve to show that the art of historical editing is not easily learned.

The introduction might also have been a better and finer piece of work. It is full of commonplaces—references to the war, to the Entente Cordiale, and such like. The space might well have been given to some generalizations on the light thrown upon the history of the town and country during the period. Mr. Twemlow rightly disclaims any intention of writing a history of Liverpool as yet; but such a summary would not nullify that disclaimer and would have been invaluable to students. The subject-index, excellent as it is, cannot take the place of such a section in the introduction. As Mr. Twemlow hopes to edit other Liverpool manuscripts, we hope that this criticism will be received in the spirit of suggestive kindness in which it is given.

W. P. M. KENNEDY.

*Education and Social Movements, 1700–1850.* By A. E. DOBBS, formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1919. Pp. xiv, 258. \$3.50.)

"THE chapters in this volume were intended to form part of a history of English education in modern times, with special reference to movements of democratic origin or tendency" (preface). There are seven chapters, with the following titles: The Social Environment on the Eve of the Industrial Revolution; Schools and Literature; the Era of Revolutions; the First Half of the Nineteenth Century; the Mechanics' Institutes and Higher Education; Libraries and Literature; "Education by Collision"; and the Social Outlook.

The general thesis of the author is as follows: Progress in English education has depended more largely on the structure of society and the changes brought about by economic and social movements, often but little related to education, than to the influence of its advocates, leaders, or theorists. Types of schools are agencies called into existence by social

and economic changes. Their purpose is to supply a higher degree of mental equipment to meet the needs of a more complete existence resulting from such changes. In like manner social changes cause the demand for new forms of instruction and for new subject-matter in the curriculum. Religious and political divisions, varieties of social outlook and experience, in the same or different geographical areas, are the clue to important phases of educational controversy.

Two illustrations of the work of the author may be given, in order to show his point of view and method. He discusses the relation of the religious revivals of the eighteenth century to intellectual advance, and finds that one of the first fruits of such revivals was the growth of the notion that every child should learn to read the Bible—a definite advance toward the idea of national education. During the Methodist revival a great wave of enthusiasm produced the Sunday-school movement of the eighties. This was the most widely organized medium up to this time for the instruction of young and old. In many cases secular as well as religious instruction was given in these schools. Again, he finds that this was one of the important influences which stimulated interest in state elementary schools.

The industrial revolution is discussed in detail, particularly in its aspect as a challenge to the old traditional classification of society into well-defined groups, duly subordinated to one another. The result of this view was the attempt to confine popular education within narrow bounds, on the ground that universal instruction of the people would incapacitate them for necessary labor and diffuse an atmosphere of social unrest. But the industrial revolution engendered the idea that the working-man had as much right to educational training and opportunity as other classes. Thus there was an intellectual side to the industrial revolution which produced a social unrest and resulted in efforts of the working classes to establish educational agencies for their own instruction and needs.

This book is an attempt to explain educational movements and progress from a different standpoint than that taken by the authors of the conventional histories of education. In the latter case, emphasis is placed on the theories of educational reformers, with a meagre statement of the facts of educational history. There is little or no recognition of environment or of those social and economic factors which for the most part make reformers and reforms possible. In the present volume the author has made a real contribution to the subject of the development of education in England. His book however has much material which does not have a close relation to educational movements. There is no bibliography, unfortunately, though this is partially compensated for by fairly complete citations in the foot-notes.

MARCUS W. JERNEGAN.

*The Treaties of 1785, 1799, and 1828 between the United States and Prussia as interpreted in Opinions of Attorneys General, Decisions of Courts, and Diplomatic Correspondence.* Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1918. Pp. viii, 207. \$2.00.) ✓

*The Armed Neutralities of 1780 and 1800, a Collection of Official Documents preceded by the Views of Representative Publicists.* Edited by JAMES BROWN SCOTT. [*Id.*] (*Ibid.* 1918. Pp. xxxi, 698. \$5.00.) ✓

WITH these two volumes the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace continues its very practical peace work by presenting to the public in general and students of international relations in particular a summary of the relevant authoritative information on two subjects of diplomatic history which has not hitherto been available in concise form in larger libraries and is not at all to be had in the smaller institutional library.

Treaty relations between the United States and Germany had been so smooth and unruffled, because of the lack of pressure of any large issue, that the existence of the archaic treaties of 1785, 1799, and 1828 had been forgotten or unnoticed by nearly everyone except the international lawyer until the period of American neutrality arrived in 1914, when the public suddenly awoke to the fact of their existence and the remarkable provisions written into their articles. Judged by the principle of *rebus sic stantibus* these treaties long ago would have become extinct; the most remarkable thing about them is that up to the very end both governments have acknowledged their binding validity; and that article XII. of the treaty of 1828 provides for the express contingency of war between the high contracting parties, notwithstanding the general principle of abrogation of treaties automatically upon the outbreak of war between the parties. Much of the space devoted to decisions of American courts deals with the acknowledgment by the two governments of the continuation of the treaty after the federation of the German Empire on the pedestal of Prussia.

In compiling these treaties in such handy form Dr. Scott has done for us another great service. The volume will be extremely useful for reference in the thousands of cases that will arise in the immediate future over the claims of American citizens against the imperial German government for damages arising out of illegal naval warfare. In this regard it is almost essential for the lawyer dealing with international claims, as well as for the teacher of contemporary history.

Certain minor details of the editing are puzzling. In general the work is very carefully done, and the reader is grateful for the presentation, in English and French in parallel columns, of the original drafts of the several treaties, the copies on file in the archives of the Department

of State being cited as authority for the accuracy of the text here given in printed form. Article XII. of the treaty of 1828, renewing articles XIII.-XXIV. of the treaty of 1799, refers to the last paragraph of article XIX. of the latter treaty, which paragraph is not to be renewed. Turning to the article in question the reader finds that the English text has but one paragraph, while the French has two, the division into paragraphs in this instance being a matter of utmost importance. A note by the editor on this apparent discrepancy in the original documents would be helpful. Typographical errors occur in but very few cases, as in the sixth and thirty-first lines on page 125. For the purposes of the average reader a more uniform arrangement of the summaries of the court cases, and of the labelling of their jurisdiction, might be asked by the over-critical reviewer.

When edited, the volume on *The Armed Neutralities of 1780 and 1800* bade fair to enjoy a timeliness of interest equal to that since claimed by the work mentioned above. The rapid procession of events and march of opinion between the day of Mr. Wilson's "armed neutrality" address to Congress, February 26, 1917, and the momentous sixth day of April relegated the subject of armed neutrality back to its old position of academic interest and the curiosity of historical scholars and international lawyers. Thoughts of armed neutrality in February, 1917, proved only a flash in the international pan—flintlock opposition to modern artillery. There has been no armed neutrality since 1800. Will there ever be another? The brief rise into public attention of the subject produced this convenient compilation, for which the student of the revolutionary wars and America may be profoundly thankful. Before Dr. Scott brought together in such handy form this collection of authorities and documents, they were scarcely available, all of them, even in the largest libraries; it is to be doubted whether all the authorities quoted are shelved together in more than half a dozen libraries on the continent. Now, thanks to the Carnegie Endowment and the editor, they are available in practically every county in the United States.

The first third of the work is devoted to a presentation in alphabetical order of the comments of the leading publicists on the armed neutralities, precisely and fully quoted, with frequent notes by the editor. Not only the long recognized authorities are included, but also such recent writers as the Norwegian Boye, writing in 1912. An explanatory biography of the author prefaces each extract. The remainder of the book is allotted to the publication of state papers, not easily available, dealing with the armed neutralities of 1780 and 1800. Neutral protests over captures, particularly the protests of Denmark and Sweden, with the replies of the British government, fill much of the space, and develop the opposing constructions of international law which finally led to the formation of the "leagues" of neutrals to enforce what they decided to be their rights. The treaties and formal acts of accession by neutrals to the principles of armed neutrality are published.

In addition to the documents dealing with the armed neutralities of 1780 and 1800 appears the treaty of March 27, 1794, between Sweden and Denmark, the effort of French diplomacy to start a back-fire in the face of the engulfing maritime policy set up by England in the coalition treaties of 1793 and the arbitrary Orders in Council of the years 1793 and 1794. The reader regrets, once this subject is touched, that an extract from only one of these several treaties of 1793 is published (the Anglo-Spanish convention of February 21). A good comprehension of the British naval-diplomatic system of 1793-1794 cannot be had without a perusal of the treaties with the other nations of the coalition. While the work was being done, it would have been most useful to include also a summary of these Orders in Council, with the protests of the neutrals and replies to the same, particularly because the diplomacy of the United States was so closely connected with the system. There is no mention of the invitation to the United States by the two Scandinavian powers to join their abortive armed neutrality of 1794,<sup>1</sup> nor of their failure to duplicate the agreements of 1780, for one reason because of the refusal of the United States to accept its first tempting invitation to join an entangling alliance. Any one who has read the English, French, and Scandinavian despatches of the years 1793-1800 will realize that the possibility of a counter-coalition in the shape of armed neutrality against Great Britain was the pole-star of French diplomacy as regarded England. The reader does not discover any of the documents indicating this, nor any notes explaining it, in this volume. It is certainly the introduction to the final consummation of the armed neutrality of 1800. Perhaps the specific title of the book, however, does not demand the inclusion of these state papers of 1793-1800.

S. F. BEMIS.

*Authority in the Modern State.* By HAROLD J. LASKI, sometime Exhibitioner of New College, Oxford; of the Department of History in Harvard University. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1919. Pp. 398. \$3.00.)

THIS work consists of five lengthy chapters, each subdivided into several topics or minor chapters. Chapter I., which gives its title to the book, is a sort of sequel to the author's earlier work *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty*, and is to be followed by "a definitely constructive analysis of politics in the perspective set by the first chapter of this present volume". Chapters II., III., IV., are related studies giving expositions of the political theories, especially with reference to sovereignty, of Bonald, Lamennais, and Royer-Collard, French writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The first writer, reacting against the

<sup>1</sup> See the article, "The United States and the Abortive Armed Neutrality of 1794", in this *Review*, XXIV. 26-47. Ed.

teachings of the Revolution, taught, as against individualism, a theory of social solidarity, theocratic in type, under the direction of a divinely appointed sovereign ruler. Lamennais, on the other hand, starting from somewhat the same basis, during the course of his long life slowly evolved from an ardent supporter of royalty, the Church, and papal supremacy into an advocate of spiritual and democratic freedom in religion and in politics, ending in his expulsion from the Church and the condemnation of his later works. The third writer stood midway between the *ancien régime* and the newer radicalism, and sought to work out a compromise point of view by providing checks against despotism, through emphasis on liberty of the press and of the conscience and a stable government of a parliamentary type.

Chapter V. is an interesting study of the growth of associations (syndicalism) in the administrative system of France; a tendency arising, he argues, as a reaction against the older teaching that civil servants are mere cogs in the machinery of government without voice or protest, and a consequent movement to democratize administration through the admission of the right of civil servants to organize and to strike, if necessary, for recognition of rights and for a voice in the administrative system.

These last four chapters are excellent studies of their subjects, thorough, fairly clear in thought, and well worth careful attention from those interested in the development of French political theories and tendencies.

Chapter I., Authority in the Modern State, is more definitely the author's own study of sovereignty, based chiefly on English sources, with occasional references to such American authorities as the *New Republic*, the *Harvard Law Review*, and Professor Roscoe Pound, and to the legal opinions of Justice Holmes, "the profoundest student of the American Constitution".

The state, to the author, "is always a territorial society in which there is a distinction between government and subjects". The state is different from *society*, and, following Rousseau, government is merely an executive organ by which the state-will can be carried into effect. The usually accepted theory of sovereignty is denied by the author, who in fact is almost prepared to reject the entire idea of sovereignty, especially in federations like the United States, or when in the future we shall have a "federalist society" (one based on pluralism); for, "a democratic society must reject the sovereign state as by definition inconsistent with democracy".

This conclusion, in the critic's opinion, is obtained through a defective definition of the state and a constant confusion of government with state and ethics with politics. Nor, in his discussion, do the distinctions between sovereignty, the legal sovereign, and governmental powers seem to be kept clear, nor the distinction between the people and the electorate, which is really a part of government. The chapter as a whole,

as an argument for a broader and more intelligent democracy, is excellent, but one may question whether (to quote the advertisement) the author's positive views are "constructive, and, for this country, almost entirely new".

In passing, one may regret that the Yale Press allowed so many typographical errors to slip through.

J. Q. DEALEY.

*The Life of Lamartine.* By H. REMSEN WHITEHOUSE. In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1918. Pp. xiii, 464; ix, 527. \$10.00.)

IN the history of Europe in the nineteenth century there were at least three men of great and commanding importance, who succeeded in so conducting their lives, and in so fashioning their personalities, as to render the task of any would-be biographers extraordinarily parlous and harassing. Either they floated so frequently in cloudland, or burrowed so constantly underground, or assumed such Protean shapes at different times under the pressure of circumstances or in response to the inner promptings of their natures, that they repeatedly, and often at very critical moments, elude or baffle the investigator and writer who is disposed to do them honor by devoting years of a precious lifetime to the chronicling of their manifold doings and sayings for the perpetuation of their fame and the edification or enlightenment of posterity. The task of the biographer is hard enough in all conscience without the admixture of these elements of mystification or contradiction. If you float in the clouds, refraction tends to leave a distorted image upon the retina of the interested spectator. If you burrow underground, the earth being more or less opaque, our vision is obstructed. If you assume Protean shapes, we soon become distracted and lose our confidence in ever seizing you at the authentic and veritable moment of self-revelation, and we retire from the contest defeated and indignant and you go without your biographer.

The three men I have in mind who would unquestionably have fared better at the hands of scholars had they presented fewer complexities and obscurities of life and character, are Mazzini, Napoleon III., and Lamartine. It palpably requires such an exorbitant amount of bird-lime to catch these particular creatures that the student is very likely to abandon the chase before it has begun. No one in any land has yet arisen to draw an adequate portrait of Mazzini or of Napoleon III.

However, the third member of our trying trilogy has found what he so richly deserved, a patient, thorough, and talented biographer who has succeeded admirably in filling one of the *lacunae* of contemporary historical literature that sadly needed filling. The result is a book which does justice to its subject, and which is as authoritative and final as any work of historical scholarship and personal interpretation is ever likely



to be. For this book is built four-square. Spaciously planned, the execution is commensurate with the design. The foundations are deep and solid, and the art which the author displays in the use of his material is of a very high quality. There is here no trace of haste or superficial investigation. Lamartine was not only a most voluminous writer, but was also an habitual orator. Poems, histories, travels, reminiscences, speeches came with facile profusion from his amazingly active and versatile mind. None of this material can be ignored or slighted, for, as Mr. Whitehouse says, "Everything that Lamartine wrote partakes directly or indirectly of the nature of a confession: at times a fragment infinitely minute, yet ever a particle of his soul". The material is abundant but frequently difficult to use, because of the abstract, imaginative, transcendental qualities of much of Lamartine's thought, yet this material has been explored and exploited by Mr. Whitehouse with comprehension, with penetration, with critical detachment and with sobriety of judgment. Also he is thoroughly familiar with the rich and growing monographic literature concerning Lamartine. His bibliographical references show the completeness of his research, and his handling of many difficult problems in Lamartine's life reveals his mastery of the field.

As Lamartine said of himself, there were manifold men dwelling within him: "the man of sentiment, the man of poetry, the man of the rostrum, the man of action". Each of these individuals is adequately presented by Mr. Whitehouse with a nice discrimination and with rare discernment. The growth of Lamartine's multiple genius is carefully unfolded, and we are consequently in a position, when the time arrives, to understand the marvellous revelation of power in 1848, and also the reasons for the sudden, tragic fall. This book is no essay in hagiography. Appreciative throughout of Lamartine's magnificent gifts and important services, Mr. Whitehouse is never blinded, is never partizan, is ever critical. He holds the balances very even. He hews close to the line, and never transgresses the limits of his task. He is writing a life, not a history of the times. He avoids at every step the temptation to which so many biographers have yielded, of so enlarging his canvas that the picture is blurred or out of proportion. He neither magnifies nor minifies his subject. And such is his literary talent that he can make clear such a tangle as that of the Molé ministry, and can render with remarkable spirit and fidelity, the movement, the rush, the excitement, the swiftly passing phases of the Revolution of 1848. He has written a book which holds the attention from beginning to end, and which commands, from the first page to the last, a steadily increasing confidence and respect. The result is a narrative of absorbing interest, and a vital, vivid presentment of an "honest statesman" and an "incomparable poet".

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

*Bismarck*. By C. GRANT ROBERTSON, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. [Makers of the Nineteenth Century.] (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1919. Pp. xii, 539. \$2.25.)

MR. ROBERTSON has written in many respects the best—the most thoughtful—study of Bismarck which has appeared in any language. In English, Headlam's otherwise excellent biography was written too close to Bismarck's dismissal in 1890 to allow of a proper perspective, and it treats too scantily the period after 1871. Munroe Smith's little volume was avowedly only a sketch. Lowe's two volumes are neither critical nor up-to-date. In German, Hahn's five volumes are enriched with much documentary material, but are not very readable. Lenz's reprint of his article in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* is a masterly critical piece of work on Bismarck in 1848, at Frankfort, and as Prussian minister-president from 1862 to 1871, but is not very full on the chancellor of the German Empire after 1871. Egelhaaf's scholarly volume is much fuller on the period after 1871, but not so well written as Lenz's book. Erich Marcks, who had access to the Bismarck family papers denied to others, began a readable and scholarly work which was expected to be the definitive biography of Bismarck; but by 1914 he had published only the first volume, which covers no more than the life of the "tolle Junker" up to 1848. In French, Paul Matter, with the space of three large volumes at his disposal, has written an admirable standard biography, based on the sources, full of details fascinatingly told, and remarkably objective and impartial in judgment; but few persons outside the guild of historians are likely to read three large volumes of biography, even when written with the Gallic artistry of which M. Matter is a delightful master.

Mr. Robertson's *Bismarck*, as he says in his preface, "does not profess to be a history of Germany from 1815 to 1890, nor is it specifically a biography" of the ordinary type. It tells relatively little of Bismarck's family relations, often departs from chronological sequence, and is not unduly burdened with personalia and detail. It is rather an appreciation, in approximately biographical form, of Bismarck's statecraft and of Bismarck himself as one of the makers of modern Europe. As to proportion, there are nearly as many pages to the period after, as before, 1871. It tells English readers more than they usually hear of the influence of philosophy and ideas upon Bismarck and the German people. For no one knew better than Bismarck that the theories and ideals of the aristocracy of intellect were making the Germany and the Germans of his day. His debt to the "ideologues", as Meinecke has shown, was greater than he ever admitted. The alleged originality of his solution of the federal problem in 1866 and 1871 consisted in an adaptation from principles suggested by the despised Liberal leaders of 1848, and the Bismarckian adaptation would have been impossible but for the intellectual travail of the "ideologues" between 1848 and 1871. Hence Mr. Robertson protests against the conception of Bismarck simply as a

demonic man of action, shaping German and European destiny merely by his titanic will and brute force. He shows him also as a man of titanic brain, fighting for fifty years a truceless battle of ideas with German Jacobins, Liberals, Catholics, Socialists, Pan-German nationalists, and anti-German cosmopolitans.

Mr. Robertson has generally a good *flair* for obscure motives or historical secrets hidden in the archives. He makes very shrewd inferences, for instance, in regard to the war-scare of 1875 and the Reinsurance Treaties with Russia (to which he devotes an acute appendix), as is shown by the later and fuller articles of J. V. Fuller and Serge Goriainov in recent numbers of this *Review*. Occasionally, however, his shrewdness overshoots the mark, as in the case of the Schnaebele affair of 1888. Misled perhaps by a phrase of Debidour's (*Histoire Diplomatique*, I. 114), Mr. Robertson ventures the conclusion (p. 460) "that the 'Schnaebele incident' was deliberately planned [by Bismarck], possibly to provoke the French into a serious indiscretion, certainly to assist the passage of the Army Bill by driving into the German elector's mind the peril from France". Unfortunately for Mr. Robertson, his venture involves an anachronism. Elections favorable to Bismarck had already taken place on February 21 and March 2, and the Army Bill had been passed with an overwhelming majority on March 11; it was not until three weeks later, on April 20, that the French police agent stepped across the frontier in Alsace and was instantly arrested and imprisoned. Equally doubtful may be the author's similar opinion that the war-scare of 1875 was employed by the chancellor "to lash up German opinion and influence the Reichstag" at a critical stage in the *Kulturkampf*.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is the information and inference which the author gleans from the critical study of the utterances of Bismarck after his dismissal. In these one sees Bismarck severely criticizing the policy of his successors, Caprivi and Hohenlohe, and obviously Kaiser William II. As these policies were in part at least a continuation and completion of Bismarck's own work, his action raises many nice questions for the historian. How far did Bismarck genuinely change his mind in the retrospect of old age and political retirement? How far, for instance, would he have gone in backing Austria in the Balkans? As far back as 1873 (*cf.* p. 353) he appears to have contemplated that "diversion" of Austria toward the Balkans which found its first marked outward expression in his securing for Austria the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878. Yet a month after his dismissal and after Caprivi's failure to renew the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia (thereby opening the way for the very thing Bismarck had always carefully prevented—the alliance of Russia and France), Bismarck wrote in the *Hamburger Nachrichten*: "Austria cannot hope to obtain Germany's support for promoting her ambitious plans in the Balkan peninsula. These Austrian plans have never been encouraged by Germany as long as Germany's foreign policy was directed by Prince

Bismarck." The Triple Alliance, he kept reiterating (*cf.* pp. 494-501), contemplated only mutual defense against possible attack and did not demand that Germany should support Austria's Balkan interests against Russia. Similarly, no one had done more than Bismarck himself to emasculate the Reichstag and prevent the valuable development of parliamentary responsibility and parliamentary control over foreign policy. Yet after 1890 he complains,

The most disquieting feature for me is that the Reichstag has abdicated its position. We suffer everywhere from bureaucracy. . . . To strengthen the Reichstag the responsibility of ministers should be increased. . . . When I became minister the Crown was threatened by the people. Hence I strove to strengthen the Crown against Parliament. Perhaps I went too far in that direction. We now require a balance of power within Germany, and I believe that free criticism is indispensable to the monarchy.

How far, one wonders, if Bismarck had remained in power, would he, or could he, have altered or reversed the policies which he himself inaugurated. These are nice questions, of infinite difficulty and complexity, which Mr. Robertson touches upon, but wisely refrains from attempting to answer with finality.

The sources from which the author writes are chiefly the great collections of Bismarck material which have been edited by Busch, Horst Kohl, Poschinger, Penzler, and others. He is also thoroughly familiar with the mass of memoirs and the secondary works. Though trained under Lavissee, he studied and visited many times in Germany and had opportunity to talk with soldiers and politicians who had known Bismarck. His volume is the result of many years of study and reflection before there was a thought of war. It is written *sine ira et studio*. He makes Bismarck a living, human being, extenuating, to be sure, none of his grossness or arrogance, but nevertheless deeply appreciating his genius, his greatness, and all that was tender and sincere in him. History written with such sympathy and poise, and on such a subject, is one of the best means of aiding a distraught world to reach a sound judgment on the causes which lay behind the Great War.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*Weltgeschichte seit der Völkerwanderung.* Von THEODOR LINDNER, Professor an der Universität Halle. Band IX. (Stuttgart and Berlin: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger. 1916. Pp. xiv, 524. M. 6.50.)

PROFESSOR LINDNER's work represents the last volume of a history of the world since the barbarian invasions, and covers the period from 1860 to the outbreak of the war in 1914. The author states that he has limited his treatment of the period to its political development, although he has allowed one short chapter to Socialism and to the Catholic church.

The book was evidently written for Germans primarily, and especial space is given to Germany and to the German element throughout the world. At times this emphasis seems a little overdone; the history of Austria is much more a history of the Germans in Austria than of the empire. Naturally the point of view is frankly German, although one is left with the impression that the author has made a sincere effort to be an historian and not a mere controversialist. Even in his last chapters which treat of the events of the ten years previous to 1914, the tone is more impartial than in many German post-war publications.

A history of the world during the last half-century in less than five hundred pages can only treat of the leading facts in the story. Few, if any, of the important facts are omitted; indeed, the author seems to show a tendency to overload his account with relatively unimportant details. At times the account becomes almost a chronology through which the reader makes his way without assistance as to the bearing these details may have on the history of the period as a whole. The treatment, throughout, follows the conventional lines and no new facts are brought forward.

The first third of the book deals with European history from 1860 to the dismissal of Bismarck in 1890. The period represents, in the view of the author, the "age of Bismarck" (p. 205), and is treated almost entirely from that standpoint. The account follows the conventional lines, but makes clear the essential facts, especially in the treatment of the internal history of the European states. The second third of the book, dealing with the history of the non-European states since 1815, is perhaps the best portion of the work. The chapters on America are clear and cover the essential points, although Americans may take issue with the treatment of the last few years of our history. The last third of the book deals with European history since 1890, and especially in the ten years previous to 1914. It is the conventional German account, in which England is the disturber of the peace, Germany the innocent victim forced to defend herself. Russia is less severely treated, although Pan-Slavism comes in for its share of the blame.

Errors in fact occur, although relatively infrequent. Among them may be mentioned the statement that Lincoln was almost unanimously elected in 1864 (p. 241) and that "Italy obtained certain police rights over the Adriatic Sea" in the settlement following the Bosnian crisis of 1908 (p. 435). The account of the period 1900-1914 contains many undoubtedly incorrect statements, which may be based on a lack of full knowledge at the time when the book was written.

The author gives at the end of the text a list of books used in writing the volume. It presents many serious gaps, especially in the section devoted to America, and has little value except as giving a list of books published on international affairs in Germany since 1914. The works are listed without order and without comment. The index is brief but usable; the format of the book leaves nothing to be desired.

Apart from its value as a compendium of events, for it is little more than that, the book presents a series of thumbnail sketches of European statesmen that provoke thought even if the reader disagrees with them. But the whole work illustrates the terrible difficulty in writing contemporary history in the midst of the prejudices of a world war.

MASON W. TYLER.

*Alsace-Lorraine since 1870.* By BARRY CERF, University of Wisconsin. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1919. Pp. viii, 190. \$1.50.)

THE purpose and tone of this book are not adequately revealed by the title; one might readily anticipate a description of German administration, a study of the temper of the native inhabitants, or both description of administrative failure and analysis of the attitude of these unwilling subjects at the outbreak of the war and throughout its course. These larger and more general aims are never entirely submerged, but they are constantly obscured by the disposition of the author to present his material in the form of a brief urging the restoration of the provinces to France. The presumption that it is necessary to argue this question at every point has resulted in an unfortunate arrangement of the material and in a disproportionate number of citations. Many of the passages quoted are very brief, so that scrutiny of the text and the character of the author cited leads to a serious interruption in the train of thought. The book would be useful to the student desiring to secure some familiarity with the material available on the subject, but is likely to weary any reader not possessed of more than the average patience.

In the handling of some of the larger questions this method of composition has become the cause of unfortunate inconsistencies of statement. The grounds for the allegiance of the natives to France are variously given. In the first reference to the matter (p. 26), much stress is laid upon the conciliatory policy of the ministers of Louis XIV.; a few pages later (p. 29), a striking passage is cited from Fustel de Coulanges which lays all the emphasis upon the influence of the French Revolution. Subsequent allusion to the matter and a citation from Reuss (pp. 90-91) seem to leave little doubt of the author's opinion, but a casual reader might well fail to appreciate the immense significance of the Revolution.

The character of the motives underlying the annexation in 1870 is also the subject of ambiguity. A brief reference in the earlier chapters (p. 19) attributes the annexation to purely military objects. Subsequently, in connection with a careful discussion of the economic significance of the provinces, it is implied that Bismarck consciously sought the iron mines of Lorraine. "Bismarck's geologists in 1871 made a mistake. They did not, as they thought, seize *all* the French iron fields" (p. 120). Now this statement is not justified by anything we know of the negotiations at Versailles in 1871, nor by the technical facts concerning these Minette ore fields. Some of the facts are evidently familiar

to the author, but there is a serious misconception involved in this portion of his discussion. There are likewise indications that the relation of iron deposits to coal deposits is not clearly understood.

In calling attention to these inconsistencies it is not intended to suggest that the book has no elements of merit and interest. There is an interesting sketch of German administrative policy; one wishes that it might have been longer and more detailed, but it is adequate as it stands. The economic discriminations against the provinces are described with much care, though there is real need of more extended treatment of a number of matters. The sentiment of the people before the war and during its course is indicated by much interesting material and brought out from many points of view, but here again one wishes the author might have chosen to tell the story at greater length.

*The European Commonwealth: Problems Historical and Diplomatic.* By J. A. R. MARRIOTT. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1918. Pp. xi, 370. \$7.50.)

IN this volume are fifteen essays first published in British reviews and selected by their author "because, though not originally designed as steps in a coherent argument, they seem to possess a certain measure of unity and consistency". "The underlying unity of the book will be found in the problem presented to Europe by the evolution of the Nation-State and the working of the influential though illusive principle of nationality." Perhaps a better basis of unity is furnished by the subtitle, *Problems Historical and Diplomatic*. All the essays deal with European diplomacy, mainly of the last hundred years. Significantly enough, four out of the fifteen are distinctly upon southeastern Europe (including one on the Adriatic question), and the Polish problem has two fairly long essays devoted to it. The introductory chapter and the "Rise of Modern Diplomacy" are slightly technical in character, almost like a treatise on international law. The subject-matter in the "Hohenzollern Tradition" and in the "Problem of Small Nations and Big States" may be readily surmised. In "Democracy, Diplomacy and War", he discusses (as of 1916), among other things, whether or not a democracy can meet successfully autocracies and aristocracies based wholly on efficiency. "England and the Low Countries" contains a valuable historical survey. Finally, in "Projects of Peace", the author leads us from the Holy Alliance to the present "European Commonwealth", the welding of which into a league, with the consequent establishment of permanent peace, he considers to be the most vital result of the World War.

In general, the narrative portions of each essay are rather too concise, except for those who are already well acquainted with the ground. Owing to their sporadic origin, some repetitions (as in chapters II. and



III., III. and V.) are met with. Some essays suffer also from too close confinement to certain memoirs and other historical works upon which these chapters appear to be largely in the nature of commentaries. Each essay reflects a different time-atmosphere, ranging from just after the beginning of the World War in 1914 to near its end. This is somewhat of a tax upon the mental agility of even the maturer reader. The author's conclusions are naturally less valuable because premised upon conditions which have ceased to exist or to have the same weight as they did when the pages were written. Austria and Hungary, for example, certainly are now less vital factors in the Adriatic question than they were. Occasionally a propagandist tone is discernible, as in "World Politics" and in "Prussia, Poland and Ireland", justifiable perhaps in view of the circumstances.

The scholarly character of the book is beyond question, in spite of the strictures made in this review. Written with restraint, with an evident desire to arrive at the true facts and to draw only such deductions as are justifiable, the contribution to the literature of the World War and diplomacy is great, even if we suggest that it might have been greater had the author revised, consolidated, and condensed his material in such a way as to change it from a series of window-pictures of world politics into a connected series of demonstrations leading definitely up to his general conclusions.

As to errors discovered—if Austria (p. 197) had the nomination of Polish kings, it is hardly correct to say (p. 198–199) that Russia was responsible. John Casimir's reign (p. 192) should end in 1668, not 1665. "Premises" (p. 236) should probably be promises. Three useful sketch maps, two of the partitions of Poland, one of the Adriatic, might escape notice, since they are not listed in the table of contents, though mentioned in the preface. Maps of the frontiers of nationality in eastern Europe would have been still more helpful. The omission of an index accentuates the lack of unity. Foot-notes, mainly referring to secondary authorities, are fairly numerous.

ARTHUR I. ANDREWS.

*Belgium: a Personal Narrative.* By BRAND WHITLOCK, United States Minister to Belgium. In two volumes. (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1919. Pp. xi, 661; vi, 818. \$7.50.)

THIS narrative gives a vivid picture of conditions in Belgium from the beginning of the war until April 2, 1917, when Mr. Whitlock left the country. No other book has so well portrayed the courage and spirit of the Belgians. The author is skillful in selecting significant details which reveal the indomitable character of the people, the "irrepressible *zwanze bruxelloise*" which delighted in eluding the German orders and in making them ridiculous.

Mr. Whitlock is at his best in descriptions of individuals. His pregnant words make of them living men: the revered Cardinal Mercier, the

wise and witty M. Francqui, the dauntless Bâtonnier Théodor, and many another. He is generous in his praise of his diplomatic colleagues, especially Villalobar, the Spanish ambassador. He denounces the German system of frightfulness and hypocrisy, but his detestation of it does not lead him into exaggeration. He often heard that the Germans had cut off the hands of little children, but was not convinced that it was true. He notes that while the English Commission published reports of this brutality, the Belgian Commission excluded all such testimony.

Much of the narrative dwells on the difficulties in the work of the C. R. B. and of the C. N. (Comité National), of which less is known in this country, but which was indispensable to the success of the C. R. B. Mr. Whitlock is full of admiration for the workers in the Relief Commission, and especially for Vernon Kellogg and Hoover. Of the latter, the Spanish ambassador said, "Hoover is the best diplomat of us all".

There are about 375 pages of documents, usually given in French and in translation. As these are in fine print, actually about one-third of the whole contents of the two volumes consists of documents. These are well selected, especially those relative to the deportations, and a large part of them had not been published in this country. There are very few, however, relative to the systematic economic spoliation of the country. This is unfortunate.

In spite of its many excellencies, the narrative has some faults as an historical source. The account of Miss Cavell's trial is inaccurate. Mr. Whitlock was ill at the time and had to get his information from others. He states (II. 150) that the "trial took place on Oct. 7, 8, and 9", although (p. 98) he had written that "the trial was concluded on Friday". That this was the fact is established by the report of M. Leval (p. 123), "the trial took two days, ending Friday the 8th"; and by Miss Cavell's own record in her prayer-book. Mr. Whitlock states (p. 150) that the death sentence was "on October 11 at 4:30 in the afternoon", although (p. 140) he had stated that on October 10, Miss Cavell, "already doomed to death", had written a farewell letter. Miss Cavell stated in her prayer-book that she was "condemned to death, 8th Oct." "at 10:30 A. M." (See Whitlock, II. 157, and facsimile of her statement in Hugh Gibson, *Journal from our Legation in Belgium*, p. 357.) Other inaccuracies in the report of the trial might be noted if space permitted.

In his account of *La Libre Belgique* he states that "neither editor nor printer was ever discovered" (I. 645). As a matter of fact, there were several editors and some were caught and sentenced; the most important, probably, was Father Delehay, so well known for his work in hagiography. The list of the members of the C. R. B. at the end of volume II. is inaccurate, and unless Mr. Whitlock was in error in his letter to M. Villalobar (p. 724), there are several omissions. The translations of documents are sometimes infelicitous and inaccurate; they remind us of the official translations made in the State Department.

The proof-reading was extremely bad; there are very many mistakes, in four languages; words are misspelled, accents omitted, dates changed, names twisted, sometimes so as to be almost unrecognizable (Selby for Sedley, II. 800). The publishers were negligent in the making of these expensive volumes. There is no index, and this detracts seriously from the value of the work. The advertisement on the paper cover to volume I. is misleading: "The Story of the Heart of the War by the One American Who saw it All".

DANA C. MUNRO.

*Russia's Agony.* By ROBERT WILTON. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1919. Pp. xvi, 357. \$5.00.)

MR. WILTON has spent many years of his long life in Russia and at the time of the outbreak of the war and the revolution was correspondent of the London *Times*. He knew personally a number of the prominent men of Russia and many of the leaders of the old régime, their aspirations, and their machinations. He is, therefore, particularly well qualified to speak of the things and the men with whom he has come in contact. The book is divided into four parts and a conclusion: Part I., Slavdom, the Tatars, and Autocracy; part II., "Democracy", "Socialism", and "Freedom"; part III., Russia at War; part IV., Kornilov and the Cossacks; Conclusion: the New Russia, etc.

Every time that a new book on recent history in Russia appears, the historian offers a silent prayer that in it he may find a fair and broad interpretation of the events of the last five years. This hope was especially strong when Mr. Wilton's work was announced, because Mr. Wilton has had such unusual opportunities for observation. To some extent the book accomplishes its purpose, but, taking it as a whole, it has failed to come up to expectation.

As a usual thing the same type of man represents the London *Times* and the Court of St. James in the Russian capital. Both men are familiar with the gossip of the Winter Palace and the intrigues of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. They understand the autocrats, and they have more than a speaking acquaintance with liberals like Miliukov and Rodzianko and others like them who approach the English ideal of a country gentleman and who express a genuine admiration for English democracy and English institutions. But men of the Kerenski and Plekhanov type, men who work for a different social ideal than the one advocated by the average English squire, our correspondents do not understand and do not sympathize with. Mr. Wilton's best chapters are those that deal with the court and the war and his poorest are those that discuss "Democracy", "Socialism", and "Freedom". If he had said nothing more his quotation-marks in themselves show sufficiently his point of view, his contempt, his lack of charity toward the Russian revolutionists of 1917 when they were taking their first lessons in democratic government. Socialism is Mr. Wilton's *bête noire*, but there is

nothing in the book to indicate that he has reached his conclusions after a careful and serious study of the subject. On the other hand, the numerous errors lead one to believe that his attitude toward the Socialists is influenced more by prejudice than by reason and knowledge. Plekhanov's part in the organization of the Russian Social Democratic party is not mentioned; the division of the party into Bolshevik and Menshevik factions is placed at Stockholm and not London where it actually took place. When the author says that "German Socialism contains no element corresponding with the Bolsheviks", he shows that his grasp of German Socialism is not much deeper than of Russian. For Kerenski and his Socialist associates of the summer of 1917 Mr. Wilton has little charity and much ill-will, and he brings many charges against them without producing any evidence. "In 1915 and 1916 he [Kerenski] carried on revolutionary propaganda with funds sent from Germany." He "lived in the Winter Palace, used the Emperor's carriages and motors, drank his champagne, and fed lusciously out of his gold plate", and his ministers "used the Imperial Crowns for nuptial ceremony". It is not the Russian leaders alone who are denounced, but men like Arthur Henderson and Albert Thomas, "British and French pacifists" who "worked unremittingly for the success of the Soviet plan", also receive Mr. Wilton's attention. The Kerenski-Kornilov affair is not treated in an unbiased and judicious manner. To speak of the revolutionists of the spring and summer of 1917 as a "horde" committing "excesses against their own officers and innocent women and children", and drunken soldiers "littering" the sidewalks, is hardly a fair statement of the situation. Here and there bestiality manifested itself, but it was the exception rather than the rule.

It is not difficult to understand the author's bitterness. He wrote the book in 1917-1918, at a time when the heart of every Englishman and American in Petrograd was aching at the sight of the disintegration of the Russian army and at the thought of the additional suffering this collapse would bring to the men on the Western Front. No doubt Mr. Wilton felt this more keenly than others because he had a son in the army, and this explains and in part excuses his attitude toward the revolution and the revolutionists. These very facts, however, diminish the value of the book for historical purposes.

F. A. GOLDER.

✓ *Problems of Peace from the Holy Alliance to the League of Nations: a Message from a European Writer to Americans.* By GUGLIELMO FERRERO. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1919. Pp. iii, 281. \$1.50.)

THIS little volume is confessedly a product of the war. Indeed it has been characterized—and that not altogether unjustly—as very good propaganda. In the introductory chapter addressed to Americans, the

author dwells with fine appreciation on the marvellous change in American public opinion during the first two and a half years of the war. Viewed in the light of our aloofness and calm indifference to European matters noticed on his visit to this country in 1908, he regards our participation in the World War as little short of the miraculous. But the miracle happened, and it is the part of wisdom "that the men of the old and the new world, now united in a common brotherhood of danger and a common duty", study the antecedents of the tragedy in order better to understand what must be done to safeguard the future.

In six short chapters Professor Ferrero reviews the background of the war for American readers. The mistaken arrangements of the peace congresses of the nineteenth century, and the reactionary tendencies of Austria furnish the chief topics of the first three chapters. The misfortunes of Italy are thrown into high relief by a clear, trenchant style that at times verges on the sensational. In speaking of the Congress of Vienna, for example, he says: Italy "was placed in bondage by the very Congress that should have set her free", "chained to the corpse of a dead age". "For ninety-nine years"—not therefore to 1870 only, but to 1914, and possibly later—"she continues the slave of conditions established at Vienna". Germany like "Italy had to lament the loss of liberty . . . and the two should therefore have been bound together by mutual sympathy in a common misfortune. But this did not come about. Even then the German people wanted unity only to despoil others". France on the other hand was deeply "moved with compassion", etc. Judgments such as these, taken in conjunction with the moderation in dealing with the overthrow of Mazzini's ill-fated Roman Republic by France in 1849, indicate the tendency to read the past in the light of the present.

The chapter on the German Peace and the Germanization of Europe (1870-1914) is in many respects the best. The worship of force and of materialism are very well expressed in the passage on "the potent engines of iron animated by fire" (p. 207). Italy's case for entering the war is not as strongly stated as the terms in article VII. of the Triple Alliance agreement would lead one to expect. Possibly the Russo-Italian pact of 1909 was known. The alliance with the Central Powers is interpreted as a remnant of the old Austrian domination. Failure to secure full satisfaction for the irredentist claims the author regards simply as a perpetuation of that domination in another form. He is not very explicit as to the limits of the unredeemed Italy, but expresses his confidence that "by the time this book is published, the lands desired by Italy will have passed into her possession by force of arms, but Italy does not wish to be suspected of confronting Europe and America with the peremptory argument of force".

On the question of carrying the will of the people into international affairs, Professor Ferrero urges the acceptance by the League of Nations of three rules of conduct: first, to deal only with established

governments, second, to respect nationality, and third, to reduce armaments. And to accomplish this the United States must assume her share of responsibility. "Western civilization is a grandiose Gothic vault . . . one of its arches is Europe, the other America. If either arch is broken, the other will be endangered."

WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.

#### MODERN ORIENTAL HISTORY

*An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century: a Summary Account of the Political Career of Zahir-ud-din Muhammad, surnamed Babur.* By L. F. RUSHBROOK WILLIAMS, Fellow of All Souls College, Fellow and Professor of Modern Indian History in the University of Allahabad. [Publications of the Department of Modern Indian History, Allahabad University, no. 3.] (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, for the University. 1918. Pp. xvi, 187. \$3.00.)

THE life of Babur has been told repeatedly, first by himself, in Turki, then in the Persian translation, and finally in the English versions of Erskine and Stanley Lane-Poole. The present author acknowledges his indebtedness to all these, as well as to the translation of the Turki text by Mrs. A. S. Beveridge; but he calls attention to the fact that Erskine's conclusions were faulty because he failed to make use of five important sources, of which one is the Shaibani Nama (this shows the Usbeg side of the struggle between Babur and Shaibani), and that Lane-Poole's work (in the *Rulers of India*) is based entirely on translated sources, one of which is unreliable even in the original. In short, there was need of a "summary account" of Babur drawn from all sources, and this is here presented in the Allahabad University Lectures for 1915-1916. If the material is thus not very novel, it is at least more correctly stated than has hitherto been possible when, as in the case of Erskine's *History*, a contemporary historian such as Khwandamir was not even known.

Babur's life lacks the glamor that hangs about that of his greater grandson Akbar. Intellectually he was the inferior, but in activity, in warlike energy, in his dash, patience, and endurance, he was second to none. To found a new empire in India a conqueror, not an administrator, was needed, and Babur the Tiger, ruler at twelve years of the little province of Farghana (now in Russian Turkistan), and victor in battle and conqueror of Samarkand at the age of fifteen, was the predestined man for the work, if inheritance may be said to determine destiny. He united Mongol blood and Persian culture, as did his maternal grandfather, who was conspicuous for the same paradoxical combination, and Babur as fifth descendant of Tamerlane (Timur the Lame) and, on his mother's side, fourteenth descendant of Chingiz

Khan, may be said to have had fighting blood by double inheritance. Born in 1483, son of a fourth son and hence heir to the smallest heritage of the old ruler of Herat, fighting, failing, conquering, betrayed, a homeless vagabond, a persistent hoper, before he was twenty-two he had endured as many vicissitudes as most kings suffer in a long life. But by twenty-two he had made himself master of Kabul and determined his destiny. Till then it was a problem to him whether to work west and rule from Herat or Samarkand, or to turn his back on his native heath and advance east to reconquer the realm his ancestor Timur had held. He was but a boy when he decided definitely to strike east from Kabul, and doubtless he was strongly influenced by the thought of imitating his glorious model. At any rate it was at this time that he proclaimed himself Padshah, no equal among equals but head of all the Mughal or Mongol world.<sup>1</sup>

The most picturesque incident in the youthful hero's career is the long march through a veritable blizzard before he entered India; but everything pales before the audacity of the entry itself. Despite the fact that Ibrahim, the Afghan ruler of Delhi, could place more than a hundred thousand men in the field ("twice that", sneers Babur, "if he were willing to pay for them"), Babur invaded India with only twelve thousand men all told, and at his first great battle of Panipat he was outnumbered five to one at the most conservative estimate (not counting camp-followers). His victory was due only partly to his use of firearms, though it is noteworthy that they play an important rôle in this and subsequent military activities. Babur had learned a lesson from the defeat of Shah Ismael, in 1514, at the hands of the Turks, who already used guns; and he secured Ustad Ali and then Mustafa, Ottoman Turks, to manage artillery and musketry for him. When he got to Agra he himself made a gun that carried a "big ball" sixteen hundred paces. Two other incidents in Babur's life are characteristic: first, his spectacular "breaking of wine-cups" in the presence of his army, when he induced all his nobles to renounce strong drink with him and thereby filled his despondent army with new enthusiasm; second, his "sacrifice of self". His son and heir Humayun lay dying, and the father walked thrice around the bed, drawing into himself the deadly disease. At least, he so believed and Humayun lived, while Babur slowly died (1530). But victory, ease, self-indulgence, had already weakened the Tiger. He needed adversity to be strong. Wine, for he failed to keep his pledge, women, and leisure were his destruction; by forty-eight he was used up. "So died a very gallant gentleman", concludes the author; also an empire-builder, whose realm remained till the British absorbed it.

The author has consulted all the native authorities and has embellished his little book with maps and plans, and also with fifteen illustrations from the Alwar and less known Agra College codices, for the

<sup>1</sup> The author consistently uses both forms, Mughal in the broader popular sense, and Mongol in the narrower ethnical sense.



use of which he was indebted to the Maharajadhiraj of Alwar and Mr. Cuthbertson Jones, principal of Agra College.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

✓ *Geschichte Aegyptens im 19. Jahrhundert, 1798-1914.* Von ADOLF HASENCLEVER. (Halle-am-Saale: Max Niemeyer. 1917. Pp. xv, 497.)

EGYPT has always been a subject of much interest to students of history. It will remain so, if only because of its geographical position. And, because of its geographical position—almost at the junction of three continents—this history must perforce be varied. In the book before me, Professor Hasenclever has endeavored to give a history of the country during the years 1798-1914, which he somewhat loosely calls the nineteenth century; perhaps he should have said, the period between Napoleon Bonaparte and William Hohenzollern. For, as he very rightly takes the Napoleonic period as the one in which Egypt once more became a matter of concern for Europe, so he looks upon the Great War as determining for some time to come the future of the Nile region.

As a German, writing during the years 1916 and 1917, it is quite natural that Hasenclever's pen should be dipped in anti-British ink. Yet it is at times fatiguing for the reader to be forced to read all the ill-tempered and churlish adjectives that he attaches whenever his subject forces him to mention Great Britain and British doings. In a book dealing with Egypt—and especially since 1882—this must be reasonably frequent; so frequent as to make the perusal at times nauseating. Now and then there is the evident attempt to be just to Great Britain; *e. g.*, in his description of the crisis in 1838-1841 (p. 137); in his record of English policies in the Sudan (p. 340); in his estimate of Lord Cromer (p. 354); or in his description of the Liquidation Law of 1885 (p. 393). But, in general, his terms are so ill-favored and uncouth as to make it evident that he has written in the heat of war-fever and under the impulse of disappointment caused by the failure of the Turks and the Germans to drive the English out of the country (p. v). Thus, England is wanting in every "sozialen Empfinden" (p. 403); the great dam at Assuan is always called a "Staudamm" and is described only as a "fitting monument of English power" (p. 407). Lord Cromer's attitude toward Abbas Hilmi is a seemly example of "the unscrupulous methods of the English government" (p. 431). The stories told about the prodigality and squanderings of Ismail Pasha are "a nicely fashioned tale put together by the French and the English" (p. 182)—though on the very following page our author is bound to acknowledge this squandering as a "Tatsache". And even the "Scrap of Paper" treaty theory finds an advocate in him (p. 136), on the excuse that the recent war has been a "Krieg aller gegen alle"!!

But let me hasten to say that Professor Hasenclever has given us a very scholarly account of the events as they have occurred, carefully

documented and richly commented upon. He is long-winded, as most German writers are; and he is long-sentenced, some of his periods covering fully half a page. One can easily overlook these faults and make allowance for his anti-British spite and find much that is readable in the volume. But a *History of Egypt*, as its title says, it is not—as we to-day understand the word history. There is not a word descriptive of the inner and real life of the people whose story the author is presumed to tell; not a line about the literary and scholarly doings of the many men who have added, by their prose and their poetry, to the rich literature of the Arabic-speaking peoples. There is no account of the important Coptic minority and its relations to the Mohammedan majority. The great Azhar University is mentioned here and there; but a *History of Egypt* during the nineteenth century cannot afford to omit a description of the influence radiating from this, perhaps the largest university in the world, and from some of its leaders, such as the late rector, my dear friend Mohammed Abdu. Even the peculiar position occupied by non-British Europeans is passed over in silence, despite the fact that the anomalous consular powers exercised in Egypt account for many of the difficulties experienced by the British resident. Professor Hasenclever, I think, feels this want himself; and in his preface he is careful to say that he had in mind to write only a “political history” of the country, and that he has dealt with cultural and other questions only in so far as they have a bearing upon this *political* history. But this is to give us merely the shell of that which we wish to know. I suspect that one reason for this course is the author’s ignorance of the language spoken in the country and in which the natives write.

Another reason is to be found in the fact that the work of Professor Hasenclever is that which he and his German friends would call a *Tendenzschrift*. It is written to prove the false position in which Great Britain has placed herself since 1882, when she felt bound to go into Egypt and to remain there, as well as to assert the right of the Ottoman government to consider the country a part and a parcel of Turkish dominions. In fact, Professor Hasenclever goes beyond this. His thesis is that ever since Napoleonic times, Great Britain has had in mind the inclusion of Egypt in her far-spun schemes of empire (p. 37); and that all the subsequent acts of that power are nothing more than means well thought out to put these plans into execution.

It is perfectly true that Great Britain’s position in Egypt has been a peculiar one. But any one who has taken the trouble to study the history of Great Britain during the second half of the nineteenth century and who knows the position taken in such matters, especially by the Liberal party under Bright, Gladstone, and others, will be slow to charge it with intentional imperialism of this sort. In fact, Great Britain is perhaps the only power which, having gained possession of lands outside its own territory, has willingly given up such lands, *e. g.*,

the Ionian Islands and Heligoland; and the use made of the latter by Germany during the recent war (and in which Hasenclever, p. 301, rejoices) will not aid those who demand that she shall continue such self-denying conduct. It is now well recognized that Great Britain was forced to go into Egypt because of the Suez Canal and in protection of her oversea dominions. Hasenclever himself (p. 45) cites the saying of Napoleon in 1798: "The European power that is master of Egypt, is permanently also master of India." France, for reasons of her own, having refused to accompany her, she went in alone. One can remember the pressure of English public opinion at the time, urging the government to hasten the departure of the British army of occupation from Egypt. But the situation in Europe was such as to make this departure impossible; especially the deeply regretted antagonism between Great Britain and France at that time. My own feeling, which has been deepened by personal observations on the spot, has been that the great mistake committed by England in 1882 was the hesitant manner in which her entrance into Egypt was effected and her hold consolidated there. More decided action would have removed many difficulties that clogged her way, and would also have been a greater blessing to the Egyptians themselves. An operation is done best if quickly accomplished and thoroughly—as the American government did in the trouble with Spain and in the affair with Colombia.

No one will deny that many mistakes have been made by the British in Egypt. At first, the interest of the bondholders was apt to obscure that of the Egyptian people. It is also true, as Professor Hasenclever points out (p. 410), that too little has been done for education; though in answer it could be urged easily that the finances of the country were always most straitened and that the dominating power had a fear of hurting the finer sensibilities of the Mohammedans, with whom religion and education are so closely bound together. Some of the British officials may not have been the proper men for the positions they occupied. But, on the whole, it can be said that the trust which Great Britain took over in 1882 has been administered with justice and with forethought for the people of the land. In 1914, the Egyptian, be he city-man or *fellah*, was in every way in a better condition than he had been for a thousand years.

The Peace Conference, sitting in Paris, has put its seal upon this bit of British work by acknowledging Egypt as a British protectorate. Professor Hasenclever, in ending his book (p. 491), is right in holding that Egypt's future would be settled "not in the hot sands of the Syrian desert or on the banks of the ancient stream", but on the blood-stained battlefields of northern France. Happily not, as he foreshadowed and desired, to be reintegrated in the Turkish Empire. Whatever qualities the Turk possesses—and I have known a number of very charming Turks—the art of ruling others in a modern and civilized way is not his. And, though both are Mohammedans, the Arab has neither inherent nor

acquired love for his Turkish brother-in-faith. What Turkish rule has meant for Egypt, Professor Hasenclever (p. 135) knows only too well.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*American Negro Slavery: a Survey of the Supply, Employment, and Control of Negro Labor as determined by the Plantation Régime.*

By ULRICH BONNELL PHILLIPS, Professor of American History in the University of Michigan. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1918. Pp. xi, 529. \$3.00.)

THE plan of this work is commendable, and it offers a substantial addition to the general store of knowledge concerning the subject discussed. The aim of the author seems to have been to present a great array of facts and, with but few expressions of opinion, to permit the facts to speak for themselves. From an examination of the early exploitation of Guinea, the reader passes through an account of the maritime slave-trade and the sugar islands, to consider the tobacco colonies, the rice coast, and the northern colonies; whence, after a brief review of revolution and reaction, he reaches the account of the cultivation of cotton and sugar in the South, the main object of the author's study. The book closes with a brief discussion of free negroes, slave crime, and the force of law.

The survey, during the period of slavery, of the great industries of the South, cotton, rice, and sugar, has been projected by one well prepared for the task; but the strongest impression produced upon the minds of many whom Dr. Phillips leads through the details he submits, will be that with the stimulated production of cotton the South grew to be more and more what it has remained, a realm where "Cotton is King". Some may go further and incline to the opinion that this rule checked what might have been a healthier if a slower growth, productive of a sounder, if less charming, social system.

The author's narrative of the cotton gins indicates, in 1800, quite a degree of mechanical ingenuity in the South; but with the turning from diversified industries and the absorption of all capital in cotton, there vanished the surplus of the corn crop, and with dwindling live stock and languishing manufactures, the South drew, from other regions, its supplies.

Yet an industrial régime was thereby swiftly established on a great scale over a vast region and one which was free from many of the evils apparently the inevitable accompaniment of such swift development elsewhere. The evidence of the confidence of the slaves in the integrity of the ruling race comes up as a fact too constantly to be ignored. The volume of testimony that they were not overworked is convincing, and, if much that is submitted were lacking, the astounding prolificacy of the slave mothers would in itself be an argument of the care bestowed

upon the race. That there "were injustice, oppression, brutality and heart burning", the author does not deny; but he asks "where in the struggling world are these absent?" On the record presented, he contends, "there were also gentleness, kind-hearted friendship and mutual loyalty, to a degree hard for him to believe, who regards the system with a theorist's eye and a partisan squint". The single concrete item of slave-breeding, which he asserts he has found while long alert for such data, is from colonial Massachusetts in 1636. There is distinct pathos in the brief account of "Mr. Maverick's negro woman"; but in addition the narrative affords evidence of a standard of chastity displayed by the imported black of that date, which a white of high station, in that region where chastity was most insistently taught, seemed incapable of even understanding.

That in such a compilation of facts some errors have crept in is not surprising. The assumption that it was William Lowndes who, in Congress in 1803, supported Governor Richardson's deplorable message on the slave-trade to the legislature of South Carolina (p. 136), is an error. The man great enough in his maturity to receive the invitations of two Presidents, to become Secretary of War, was wise enough in his youth to oppose the injurious policy of the governor of his own state. There was, however, at that time a Thomas Lowndes in Congress. Again, in reference to the rice coast of Carolina, the author says "the planters unlike those of Maryland and Virginia had never imported appreciable numbers of indentured servants to become in after years yeomen and fathers of yeomen". The planters of South Carolina had imported a number sufficiently "appreciable" in 1700 to meet the requirements of an act necessitating one such for every six negro slaves employed on any plantation; while, in the preamble of an act of 1717, we find it stated: "Whereas there has of late arrived in the Province great numbers of white servants", etc. These white servants must have continued to be imported for some decades later, as we find in 1744 an act for "the better governing and regulating white servants".

Yet these are but slight lapses in this comprehensive survey of "the government of slaves", with regard to which most readers will be apt to accept, after a perusal, the author's conclusion that it "was for the ninety and nine by men and only for the hundredth by laws", and that "it is impossible to agree that its basis and its operation were wholly evil".

THEO. D. JERVEY.

*Legislative Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia.* Edited by H. R. McILWAINE. In three volumes. (Richmond: Virginia State Library. 1918. Pp. viii, 1646.)

THESE volumes form a valuable supplement to the *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia*, the monumental work edited by Dr. McIlwaine, which has proved so valuable an assistance to the student

of colonial history. The two form a record of legislative proceedings for early Virginia perhaps more complete than that of any other colony. The journals subsequent to 1680 are well kept, fairly complete, and full of information for the historian. Unfortunately, however, they are very meagre prior to that date, the records of the council as a legislative body being entirely lacking.

The student familiar with the *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia* will find the *Council Journals* informative in many important points, throwing light upon matters left hopelessly obscure in the former work, or touched upon with great brevity. On the other hand the *Council Journals*, as edited by Dr. McIlwaine, are almost useless unless used in conjunction with the *Journals of the House of Burgesses*, for many of the communications from the House to the governors and the speeches of the governors to the assembly as a whole are omitted, references being given to the former work.

The *Council Journals* vary much in the richness of the material they furnish to the historian. In certain sessions there is only a meagre and brief outline of the proceedings; in others there are many pages of detailed addresses and discussions. Of the latter type is the session of 1685. Here the *Journals* throw a welcome light upon many of the vital questions which were vexing the colony during the period of the second Stuart despotism—the abrogation of the judicial powers of the assembly, the protests against the additional 3d. duty on tobacco, the attempts to tax the people without the consent of their representatives, the bill of ports, quit-rents, the unceasing wrangles with Governor Effingham.

Dr. McIlwaine has added to the *Council Journals* a valuable appendix of the legislative papers of the general assembly for the whole colonial period. These documents consist of petitions, propositions, grievances, claims, reports of committees, communications between the houses, and miscellaneous papers. Although a thorough search of the British Public Record Office would have disclosed many more documents of like nature, and although some of those given here have been published elsewhere, the collection is a most welcome and valuable addition to the *Journals* of the council.

It is greatly to be hoped that the publication of the journals of the two houses of assembly will be followed immediately by that of the Board of Trade correspondence and reports relating to Virginia. The letters to and from governors, presidents of the council, and secretaries, with other official papers now kept in the British Public Record Office, are after all the chief source of information for the history of colonial Virginia. Often a few lines in a letter will throw more light upon a given subject than several pages of legislative journals. The dreary record of the reporting and reading of bills, even though Hening's *Statutes* have made us acquainted with their subject-matter, is often of little value without some word of explanation of the underlying forces and conditions which moved them. The addresses of the governors to

the assembly and of the houses to the governors are of course invaluable, but they leave much unexplained, and at times tend to confuse rather than enlighten the student. That the publication of the Board of Trade papers relating to Virginia would be a very large undertaking should not be allowed to deter the state from entering upon it, for until it has been done the study of Virginia colonial history will remain almost hopelessly handicapped. Let us hope that the splendid series of volumes containing the journals of both houses of the assembly is but the prelude to even better things to come.

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER.

*New England and the Bavarian Illuminati.* By VERNON STAUFFER, Ph.D., Dean and Professor of New Testament and Church History in Hiram College. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. LXXXII., no. 1, whole no. 191.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1918. Pp. 374. \$3.50.)

THE well-known reaction of American feeling from sympathy with the French Revolution to horror of its excesses and the panic made by the strident radicals of the new Democratic Clubs on this side of the ocean is not a new story, but it becomes new when read in the ample detail and interesting co-ordination of Dr. Stauffer's study—a work of admirable scholarship and excellent literary form. His treatment of the material makes it not a mere expansion of antiquarian lore but a contribution to the spiritual history of New England life. The situation which he investigates is one that is the more intelligible to readers at the present hour when suspicion and alarm are excited by rumors of secret Bolshevik machinations for the overthrow of the bulwarks of our social order. The historical problem to which Dr. Stauffer addressed himself was to account for the alarm felt and aroused by the Federalist clergy in New England in 1798 regarding the supposed sinister conspiracy of a secret order for the overthrow of religion and government. What were the grounds for such a belief, what the explanation of an easy delusion?

Dr. Stauffer explains the psychology of the situation by an elaborate account of the growing dismay caused in conservative clerical minds by the relaxation of Puritan standards, the invasion of the theatre and social dancing, the increase of intemperance, the rise of display and worldly fashion in a new mercantile aristocracy. Fear of this apparent but over-estimated disintegration was intensified by the ever increasing bitterness of dissenters from the Standing Order when, guaranteed full religious liberty by the national constitution, they found the rights of conscience still abridged by the New England states. The conservative clergy saw in all this a menace to the church. The dissenters were embittered by seeing their conscientious principles treated as masks of irreligion. Added to this came the indignation and dread caused by



French policy after Jay's Treaty with Great Britain and the notion even of men like President Adams that French plans for world-dominion "comprehended all America both north and south" and found ready tools in the growing Democratic party. Given the intense excitement over the X.Y.Z. despatches and the mad virulence due to the Alien and Sedition Acts, we are prepared to find in 1798 an "over-wrought tension of nerves" to which the most unlikely thing became credible and a suspicion of secret forces of conspiracy at work would be held on the slightest grounds.

Dr. Stauffer then offers a history of Weishaupt's order of the Illuminati with an account of the works of Robison and Barruel which alleged a direct connection of this secret order with the destructive violence of the French Revolution. This part of the work, based on a complete and discriminating use of an extensive but obscure French and German literature, makes a valuable contribution of knowledge to fill a gap in the material available in English.

The ground is thus laid for the story of the New England agitation initiated by Jedediah Morse in a fast-day discourse on May 9, 1798. In that year of intense political feeling Morse charged a plan of the French Directory to discredit American government, rehearsed the social danger of growing irreligion and vilifications of statesmen and divines, and on the basis of Robison's work argued "reason to suspect that there is some secret plan in operation hostile to true liberty and religion". This begins two years of newspaper controversy and pulpit deliverances involving the repute of Freemasonry and the fortunes of politicians. Even bolder declarations of a secret conspiracy in alliance with the destructive radicalism of Europe were made by President Dwight and others, but Morse held the centre of the scene by his futile efforts and discrediting failure to produce evidence of the conspiracy in America.

Dr. Stauffer's thorough investigation of the sources, his discrimination in dealing with utterances of political and religious passion, and his comprehension of an episode in its large relations make his book an instance of high scholarship and intelligence.

Since the mentality of Jedediah Morse was such a factor in his time, it is useful to recall that once again his morbid suspicion and credulity betrayed him, with the result of a disruption of the Standing Order into Orthodox and Unitarian. In 1815, with even more flimsy and irrelevant evidence, he alleged an organized secret conspiracy of the liberals to pervert Harvard College and the churches from the old faith, waking to fresh life the bitter spirit of dissension which after the War of 1812 had lost the political ingredient and could use only the *odium theologicum*.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*The Papers of Thomas Ruffin.* Collected and Edited by J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, Alumni Professor of History in the University of North Carolina. Volume II. [Publications of the North Carolina Historical Commission.] (Raleigh: the Commission. 1918. Pp. xv, 625.)

THE idea of the republican system is fast becoming obsolete, and we are rapidly drifting into a pure democracy—and it is a melancholy reflection that the proposed change will leave property without Guarantees and without defence against legislative encroachment—and place the Govt. of N. C. in closer approximation to a sheer democracy than that of any of her sister States (II. 562).

Thus spoke good Weldon Edwards, Nathaniel Macon's hand-picked successor in Congress. It was the year 1857 when the Northwest was compelling Douglas to put on more democratic political clothes or yield the baton to plain A. Lincoln; the year when North Carolina seemed about to apply various democratic devices which would leave the accumulated wealth of the community at the mercy of majorities. That was a sad outlook to this good friend of Judge Ruffin three years before the Civil War.

Of equal interest to the historian will be the joyous letter of Paul Cameron, another friend of the famous chief justice of North Carolina, who, although more than comfortable in his handsome mansion at Raleigh, North Carolina, had run off to Tunica county, Mississippi, and made a good investment. He wrote March 21, 1857:

My overseer Jeter a man about 28 full of energy and quite equal as far as I can yet judge to his position says that he has never had such a time in laying up and burning, the heavy rains having brought down so much of the belted timber. Will put 300 to crop—100 acres in cotton and 200 in Corn—and from this expect to gather 100 bales of cotton [worth \$5,000 as the market then stood]—10,000 bushels of corn. as yet only 35 slaves on the place of whom 28 are out hands (II. 549-550).

From the rest of the letter one might assume that Paul Cameron of Raleigh was making a good thing indeed of his new plantation. Perhaps he was making better progress than Stephen A. Douglas of Chicago who controlled a plantation in the same region on which there were supposed to be a hundred slaves. And there were Paul Camerons all over the upper South. One day some keen student will use materials like this excellent book of Professor Hamilton's and the various county records to show the interesting fact of Middle State and Northern ownership of slaves and plantations in the lower South.

These quotations must serve to show what sort of letters Professor Hamilton and Mr. R. D. W. Connor are printing in their *Publications*. As I pointed out in the review of the former volume of this series, it is a most "delightful" group of choice North Carolinians to whom the student is introduced in this correspondence of Chief Justice Thomas Ruffin. The Devereux, the Battles, the Hoopers, Crudups, Roulhacs,

Brodnaxes, and a score of others represent the men whose word counted in their state for twenty-five years. Besides the many real pictures of these representative men and fine aristocrats whom it must have been a delight to meet and sit beside in the Episcopal church—the best club in the old commonwealth—we have glimpses of much of the life of the time, with here and there a touch of national politics, as when the redoubtable Roger Pryor proposed Ruffin for the presidency (II. 512) in 1856.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

*The Era of the Civil War, 1848-1870.* By ARTHUR CHARLES COLE, University of Illinois. [Centennial History of Illinois, vol. III.] (Springfield: Illinois Centennial Commission. 1919. Pp. 499. \$2.00.)

THIS volume maintains the high standard set for this worthy series on Illinois history. It offers to students and readers a history of varied aspects in the life of the state for the period named. It deals not only with politics, elections, and public men, but with agriculture, society, churches, schools, industry, banking, the press, religion, morality, and amusements. The volume covers the field of historical inquiry, presenting a reasonable and very interesting history of the life of the people of Illinois. The period is a notable one in American history, and the volume shows due regard for the outstanding features of that history, in which Illinois played a very important part. Themes like the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the origin of the Republican party, the Lincoln-Douglas debates, the election of 1860, are well related to the common history of the country. The notable public men of Illinois in this period, men of national standing and importance like Lincoln, Douglas, Trumbull, Yates, Oglesby, Palmer, Herndon, Lovejoy, Wentworth, Koerner, McClernand, Logan, Grant, Medill, and others, are brought into view, with facts and estimates that enable one to measure their historic importance. For these reasons, as well as for its social and industrial aspects, the volume will be valued highly by all students of general American history.

The author notices first the passing of the frontier and the coming of the railroads. It is difficult for us to remember that in 1848 Chicago had not yet been connected to the east by rail, and that Illinois was still in the stage of the prairie mud road, the prairie schooner, the river steamboat, and the stage-coach. These conditions are vividly reflected from the correspondence, statutes, and newspaper sources of that day. The politics of Illinois in the decade before the war present great themes, in the struggles of Lincoln and Douglas, the Lecompton question, and the forces and influences in this typical western state which elevated Lincoln to the presidency. The author shows in an interesting way how, in the Lecompton struggle, the Illinois Republicans, while resenting the eastern support of Douglas voiced by Greeley, themselves sought to encourage Douglas just enough to promote the split in the Democratic party, to "make it wider, deeper, and hotter", as Herndon

put it, and how the Buchanan faction, in control of national patronage, began "to lop off the heads" of Douglas Democrats.

The services and life of Illinois in the decade of the Civil War and in the struggles over reconstruction are given due attention, involving the struggle against the "Copperheads", the peace movement and the anti-Lincoln sentiment of 1864. Those who are especially interested in the rapid changes of a growing society, in revolutionary changes in industry, in the growth of western population, and in the coming to an undeveloped agricultural region of immigrant laborers in the Know-nothing days, will find in this volume much enlightening information on local history that has much more than local interest. Labor, wages, land speculation and land reform; the women's-rights movement; the temperance movement (with Chicago a "universal grogshop" and one saloon to every forty of the people in Belleville); dress reform; the conflict between the German beer-garden and the Sabbath observance of the Puritan and the Presbyterian; the churches and their sectarian divisions; the condition and numbers of the negro population; political spoils and the spoilers; the character of the press; the teachers' organizations and the influence of literary societies; the parties and plays of the people; the growth of secret societies and the effective work of the renowned Jonathan Blanchard in opposition to them—all these topics and others find space for informing treatment.

The volume is strong in its account of the growth of education in the state and in its estimate of the influence of Illinois' seats of learning. The author indulges in but little eulogy and in no grandiloquent writing, but his style is direct and interesting and he sets forth significant related facts with the weight of historical authority and with full citations to his sources. The volume has a good index, an extensive bibliography, a series of political maps showing the distribution of party opinion at various elections and the foreign-born population in 1860, together with good portraits of Lincoln, Douglas, Yates, and Trumbull. A brief review can give but an inadequate idea of the amount of valuable matter in such a volume. If the coming volumes maintain the standard set by the two so far issued (vols. II. and III.), other states than Illinois will have reason to be grateful for this notable centennial enterprise.

JAMES A. WOODBURN.

*Les États-Unis d'Amérique et le Conflit Européen, 4 Août 1914-6 Avril 1917.* Par ACHILLE VIALATE, Professeur à l'École des Sciences Politiques. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1919. Pp. x, 313. 3.50 fr.)

*Les États-Unis et la Guerre: de la Neutralité à la Croisade.* Par ÉMILE HOVELAQUE, Inspecteur Général de l'Instruction Publique. (*Ibid.* 1919. Pp. 467. 10 fr.)

IN these days when the United States is assuming a most important rôle in international politics it is especially interesting to see ourselves

as others see us. These two books reflect the views of prominent Frenchmen, well acquainted with American affairs. Viallate describes the effects of the Great War on American imports and exports, the sale of European securities in America, the exportation and importation of gold to meet trade balances, the financial adjustments necessary in this country, the European loans contracted in the United States, and finally the developments in our diplomatic relations with Germany which drew us into the war.

The most important part of the book, however, is devoted to a description of American colonial expansion since the beginning of the Spanish-American war. The author shows how the acquisition of Porto Rico, the Panama Canal, and the Virgin Islands, and the financial supervision of Haiti and Santo Domingo have gradually drawn the United States into the Caribbean Sea. From the beginning, Europeans realized much more keenly than did Americans that this situation, together with the growing complexity of international trade, would make it imperative sooner or later for the United States to abandon its policy of isolation and to participate actively in international arrangements. The last five years have revealed these things to the majority of Americans. On account of the economic advantages which the United States enjoys, Viallate has no hesitation in assigning the United States a dominant position in future world-politics.

Hovelague's book is a series of essays written at various times during the war. Two of them are reprinted from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. In the first essay, the author attempts to trace out the fundamental reasons why America refrained from entering the European conflict. He points out that American newspaper editors, magazine writers, and literary men—in fact, almost the entire intellectual class—sympathized with the Allies from the beginning of the war. Nevertheless, the mass of the people, especially in the middle and extreme West, clung to the policy of neutrality.

Hovelague attributes this attitude in part to the considerable numbers of Germans, Poles, Jews, and Irish who were irreconcilable to the Allied cause. There were also other reasons, such as the distance of the United States from Europe, the ignorance of European history and politics, and the absorption of the American people until recent years in the problems of domestic expansion. Finally, there was the almost universal interest, originally a necessity, in concrete practical affairs, a tendency which was powerfully aided and abetted by German influence on our educational institutions. In fact, America seemed in a fair way of falling a prey to that worship of force, efficiency, and material things which possessed Germany.

Nevertheless, the idealism, something more than abstract pacifism, that marked all great crises in early American history was slowly but surely awakened by the repeated acts of barbarism committed by the Germans. Finally, the Zimmermann note stirred the West as no tor-

pedoing of American vessels could possibly do, and the United States entered the war a united nation, as it never would have done at any time previous to that event.

One of the chapters in this book is devoted to a delightful description of the journey made through the United States by the French Commission, of which the author was a member. He attributes considerable importance to the quiet influence which Marshal Joffre had on the decision of Congress to adopt the principle of the selective draft rather than to depend on the volunteer system.

In a chapter on the first year of American participation in the war, the author rises to a high appreciation of America's mission. For the first time in history, he declares, a country entered a conflict on another continent entirely free from selfish motives. Indeed, the idealism which President Wilson introduced into the conflict renewed the hopes of war-weary Europe and greatly liberalized the foreign policy of all European governments. The concrete method of expressing this idealism was the League of Nations, which the author endorses in the highest terms. Hovelague, like Viallate, assigns to the United States a dominant position in future international relations.

Both books are keen and penetrating analyses of America. Viallate's book can hardly be surpassed for its clearness and simplicity. Hovelague's analysis of American public opinion during the period of neutrality may seem a little caustic at times, but his praise of American idealism after entering the war is extremely generous.

GEORGE F. ZOOK.

*Don Juan de Palafox y Mendoza, Obispo de Puebla y Osma, Visitador y Virrey de la Nueva España.* Por GENARO GARCÍA. (Mexico: Ch. Bouret. 1918. Pp. 426.)

ANY book on colonial Mexico by Genaro García is worthy of attention. The present work is no exception. When the reviewer reached the middle of the study he was prepared to pronounce it "great". Beyond this point, however, the book enters into the history of a controversy in a way which dampened his enthusiasm.

The author reminds us in his preface that the book was not written under propitious conditions. Not alone was the scholar's calm disturbed by the tragic occurrences of the Great War, but he beheld his native land "ruined, bled, and degraded by a fratricidal struggle, endless and no less violent". In spite of these unfortunate circumstances, García has produced a book of great interest and scholarly merit. It is written with a simplicity and grace which make it fascinating to read. The book is not dry-as-dust scholarship, but has real human interest.

As presented by García's pen, Palafox not only played an important part in the fortunes of New Spain, but was a human personality. His life reads like a romance. The natural son of the second Marquis of Ariza, in Spain, he was destined for drowning by his mother, rescued

and adopted by a miller, recognized by his father, and sent to college where, in very modern fashion, he "learned very little and wasted much time". At twenty he was administrator of his father's estates; then in rapid succession he became member of the Cortés of Monzón, favorite of the Supreme Minister Guzmán, fiscal of the royal Consejo de Guerra, fiscal of the Council of the Indies, and chaplain to the Infanta María, whom he accompanied to Vienna when she married Ferdinand of Austria. Meanwhile his marriage had been set aside by royal decree that he might have ecclesiastical status.

Fortune now took him to Mexico. At the age of thirty-eight he was appointed Bishop of Puebla, visitor-general of New Spain, judge of the *residencias* of the last two viceroys, and special commissioner to reform the commerce of Mexico, Peru, and the Philippines. "Such high charges had never before been combined in a single person." The prestige of the man is reflected by his journey to America, which was made in the train of the new viceroy, the Duque de Escalona. The advent was almost a royal progress, in which the bishop shared honors with the viceroy.

In America Palafox's offices rapidly multiplied, and he soon became Archbishop of Mexico and Viceroy of New Spain. His brief stay of nine years resounded with some of the noisiest struggles which disturbed the Church in the New World—quarrels whose echoes have reverberated down to the present day.

As Bishop of Puebla and Archbishop of Mexico, offices which he held at the same time, Palafox devoted himself with rare energy to destroying heathen idols and asserting the episcopal authority over regular clergy holding curacies. "Three short days sufficed Palafox to separate from the contumacious religious the curacies which they illegally held in Puebla", a feat for which a hundred superior orders had not sufficed. In Mexico he repeated the process, "softly, but without yielding an inch". Here his iconoclasm did not even spare the trophies of the conquest in the hands of the Spaniards. His capital struggle, of course, was that with the Jesuits over tithes. On this matter García throws much light by means of new documentary material, but his conclusions are marred by a manifest bias, a partizanship which perhaps reflects the present-day political struggles of Mexico. Convinced of the malice of the Jesuits, García traces in detail their resistance to Palafox during his life and their opposition to his canonization down to the present time. The proportions of this struggle, as of so many others, have been magnified in the eyes of historians by the length and number of the documents which secretaries and clerks heaped up in the archives in the course of the contest.

But Palafox's days were by no means altogether consumed by quarrels and iconoclasm. He did many things concerning which there can be no controversy. For his piety he enjoyed in his day the fame of sainthood; he engaged extensively in charitable works; in the diocese of



Puebla he erected thirty-five new churches, besides rebuilding numerous others; he encouraged the spread of religious fervor; investigated the tradition of the Miraculous Well of San Barnabé; reformed the University of Mexico; and founded two important colleges in Puebla, donating to them his fine private library. His "beloved Rachel", however, was the cathedral of Puebla. Although this edifice had been begun in 1531, when Palafox arrived it was still far from finished, and it was the custom for careless debtors to say they would pay "when the cathedral was completed". Palafox set to work fifteen hundred men directed by the best architects in New Spain, and in eight years the temple was completed. To-day it stands one of the finest churches in America, and a noble monument to the energy and taste of the illustrious bishop.

Of even more interest to the general reader and historian than García's central theme, the life of Palafox, is the incidental light which he throws upon seventeenth-century Mexico—receptions accorded viceroy, life in Puebla and the capital, the physical appearance of these important cities, education in New Spain, the University of Mexico, and scores of other important matters, all of which are treated in a way to reveal García's masterful grasp of the history of colonial Mexico. These features alone would make the biography an indispensable book.

The bibliography of over one hundred pages and over four hundred titles is one of the most valuable features of the work. The remarkable thing is that they are all in García's private library. Among them are numerous unpublished manuscripts of great importance and many imprints so rare that they are perhaps unique.

HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON.

*Papeles de Bolívar.* Publicados por VICENTE LECUNA. (Caracas: Litografía del Comercio. 1917. Pp. xv, 476.)

✓ STUDENTS of the heroic age of South American history have perhaps some acquaintance with the contributions made by Vicente Lecuna to the history of Great Colombia. He is the author of some critical studies of the technic displayed by the editors of the collections of documents which have been published concerning Simón Bolívar. Several years ago he published a scientific study of the campaign of Carabobo in *El Cojo Ilustrado*, the leading literary journal of Caracas. When a delegate from Venezuela to the Pan-American Scientific Congress which assembled in Washington, he published an inedited memoir of the Liberator concerning the Congress of Panama.

The motive for the investigations which have produced the volume under review may be best expressed in Lecuna's words.

That I might be able to write a well-ordered narrative of the campaigns of Bolívar, some years ago I began to search for documents which would fill certain gaps in the published collections. The labor has not been in vain. In the national archives of Venezuela and in the archives of the Liberator I found hundreds of inedited documents;

some of these were of great importance because they illuminated or explained capital facts, others were less important, but all of these documents were useful for the purpose of studying Bolívar's campaigns.

The labor of Lecuna has consisted in extensive investigations in the public archives of Venezuela and in the classification and arrangement of the archives of Simón Bolívar, of Carlos Soublette, and of Mariano Montilla. In addition, he has secured many letters, documents, and copies of documents from private archives in Venezuela; he has acquired a collection of rare bulletins emanating from Bolívar's army in 1813 and 1814; and he has purchased in Spain numerous proclamations and manifestos concerning the Liberator. When all the inedited or rare documents concerning Bolívar which have been discovered by Lecuna are published, they will fill several substantial volumes.

The volume entitled *Papers of Bolívar* includes certain of his letters, political thoughts, proclamations and messages, miscellanea, articles for the press, and family documents. Of his letters there are printed in this volume more than two hundred and fifty, addressed to such persons as Pedro Briceño Méndez, Mariana Carcelén de Sucre, José Fernández Madrid, Mariano Montilla, Daniel F. O'Leary, Andrés Santa Cruz, Francisco de Paula Santander, and Antonio José de Sucre. Among the political thoughts is reprinted Bolívar's memoir concerning the Congress of Panama. Among the proclamations and messages are printed drafts of some of the Liberator's messages to the Peruvian congress. The miscellanea contain a list of the books in Bolívar's library, unfortunately without date. A facsimile reproduction of *El Demócrata*, Bogotá, June 1, 1830, contains an article which throws light upon the assassination of Marshal Sucre—a topic of perennial interest to South American historical writers. The articles prepared for the press include a brief essay on public instruction and an interesting article which contains Bolívar's views concerning the condition of Spanish America in 1829. The papers which concern the family of Simón Bolívar include a letter of his mother, the testament of his father, and that of his uncle, Juan Félix Jerez Aristeguieta. These papers also include an inventory of the deceased Liberator's property, dated Santa Marta, December 22, 1830.

As Lecuna points out, the material which he edits in this substantial volume is supplementary to the great documentary collections concerning the Liberator: the fourteen volumes of documents collected by J. F. Blanco and Ramón Azpúrua and published under the title of *Documentos para la Historia de la Vida Pública del Libertador*; and the thirty-two volumes of documents and memoirs edited by Simon B. O'Leary entitled *Memorias del General O'Leary*. In general, the technic of Lecuna is admirable. Many of the documents in Lecuna's volume are printed from drafts or from originals in the archives of the Liberator. A few are taken from copies, while others are reprinted from rare periodicals. In almost every case specific mention is made of the periodical in which the document was first printed, or of the public or private repository

where it was found. In numerous cases the letters or other documents are followed by careful, scientific, explanatory notes. For example, on pages 373-375 is found an illuminating note respecting Bolívar's family. Unfortunately, the sources of the information which the editor incorporates in his notes are not always mentioned.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1916.* Volume I. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1919, pp. 507). Any one who wishes to see how much the American Historical Association has developed in the last twenty-five years would do well to compare this volume with the *Annual Reports* of the early nineties. Those volumes contained much excellent matter, but they were almost wholly composed of papers read at the meetings, for the society's activities were practically confined to those annual sessions. Now its activities are multifold, and never has there been a more impressive exhibition of them than in this volume. Nearly 300 of its 500 pages are occupied with their products—reports of the thirty-second annual meeting, held at Cincinnati, of the executive council, secretaries, treasurer, and various committees, of the thirteenth annual meeting of the Pacific Coast Branch, of the conference of historical societies, of the conference of hereditary patriotic societies, of the committee on a centre for higher historical and other studies in Washington, and of the conference which founded the *Hispanic American Historical Review*. The report of the Public Archives Commission carries with it an impressive statement of the condition of the public records of New Jersey, by a committee of New Jersey citizens, showing the appalling extent to which in that state (and similar investigations would show similar conditions in many another state) negligence and fires and pilferings and illegal detentions have deprived the commonwealth of historical materials which were once in its archives but now are not. In another interesting appendix to the same report, Professor Charles E. Chapman describes summarily the archives of Buenos Aires, Santiago de Chile, and Lima. The report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, consisting of the extant correspondence of R. M. T. Hunter, is reserved for the second volume of the report. The substantive historical papers derived from the meeting and here printed are eleven in number. Mr. Herbert Wing discusses the assessments of tribute in the Athenian Empire; Professor Paul van den Ven, of Louvain and Princeton, the question, When did the Byzantine Empire and Civilization come into Being; Professor K. Asakawa, the life of a monastic *shō* in medieval Japan; Professor Chalfant Robinson, "History and Pathology" (specifically the case of Louis XI.). Professor A. H. Lybyer gives a graphic and informing account of Constantinople as capital of the Ottoman Empire. Professors Wallace Notestein and Roland G. Usher set forth some of the chief unsolved

problems of the Stuart period and the methods by which they should be approached. Professor Guernsey Jones describes the beginnings of the Anglo-Portuguese alliance, 1640-1661; Professor Edward T. Williams, then of the Department of State, those Chinese social institutions which could serve as foundations for republican government; Mr. Charles L. Chandler, the career of Admiral Charles Whiting Wooster in Chile. The presidential address of Professor Joseph Schafer of Oregon, as president of the Pacific Coast Branch, a lucid and thoughtful paper of great merit, and an account of the history of American historical periodicals, by Mr. A. H. Shearer, conclude the volume.

*The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires.* By Arthur E. R. Boak. [University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic series, vol. XIV.] (New York, Macmillan Company, 1919, pp. x, 160, \$1.00.) This monograph aims "to treat the entire history of the Mastership", tracing "the stages of its development and its decline, showing the connection between these changes and the general tendencies which affected the administration as a whole". In carrying out this plan, Dr. Boak enumerates the different classes of *magistri*, discusses the history of the mastership, the competence, titles, honors and privileges of the master of the offices. The work is well done. Appendix A consists of seventeen pages of references to the title of *magister* in inscriptions and literature. These are arranged in a classified list, which makes it easy to use them. Appendix B gives a list of the masters of the offices. Finally, there is an index which is evidently not intended to be complete.

For the convenience of scholars who will use this work, a few corrections may be noted. The statement (p. 88) that there were sixteen state arsenals in the Orient "of which four were in the diocese of the Orient" is incorrect. There were in all fifteen, of which five were in the diocese of the Orient (see *Notitia Dignitatum*; reference correctly given by Boak). Bury, *History of the Eastern Roman Empire*, is not included in the bibliography. If Dr. Boak had used this (it actually contains very little on the master of the offices), he would probably have changed his statement as to the date when the mastership became an honorary office, as Bury (p. 108) states that the Emperor Michael offered to confer the rank of *magister* on two brigand chiefs if they would submit. There are slips in proof-reading, e. g., *dictionaire* (p. 42), Rombaud (pp. 57, 160), *Geschichte der Romischen Postwesens* (p. 80), 92 for 97 (p. 99, note 4). The discussion on pages 90-91 is mainly a repetition of the discussion on pages 41-42; incidentally, in the repetition (p. 91, note 2) Dr. Boak gives the reference correctly as chapter 38, which (p. 42, note 2) he had given as chapter 37. The last paragraph on page 69 makes statements which are evidently contradictory. Finally, why is there no reference in the list of masters to the well-known chronicler, "Simeon, magister and logothete"?

D. C. MUNRO.

*The History of Normandy and of England.* By Sir Francis Palgrave, K. H. Edited by Sir R. H. Inglis Palgrave, F.R.S. Volumes I. and II. (Cambridge, University Press, 1919, pp. lvi, xxxvi, 560; xxxix, 588.) This is the first installment of a ten-volume edition of *The Collected Works of Sir Francis Palgrave*. First issued in 1851-1857, the *Normandy and England* was the first serious attempt to give the Norman period of English history its larger setting by placing Normandy on the same plane as Wessex and "adopting Rollo equally with Cerdic". Certainly an entire volume on the Frankish empire of the ninth century, and another on the tenth, constitute a generous introduction to Anglo-Norman history. Unfortunately they give the impression that we know a great deal respecting a particularly obscure epoch. The author's wide-ranging and discursive mind lent itself easily to a form of historiography which padded out the chroniclers with comparisons and allusions to the whole course of human history. Palgrave made a serious attempt to cover the narrative sources of his subject, but without thoroughgoing or searching criticism. Thus he relies steadily on the rhetorical compilation of Dudo of Saint Quentin, to which he ascribes both originality and "general accuracy", and, what is worse, he has a way of preferring the twelfth-century translations of Dudo as more picturesque. As a matter of fact, Dudo is not a contemporary authority; he shows no evidence of "diligent inquiry"; and he preserves singularly little of popular tradition. Curiously, in spite of his great familiarity with the English public records, Palgrave makes no effort to utilize the documentary sources for Frankish history, and his critical acumen suffers painfully by comparison with the *Annales* and *Jahrbücher* upon which the student of to-day has come to rely. These defects go too deep to be remedied by a new edition, nor is the editor the one to remedy them. In spite of occasional citation of recent books, his notes are devoted chiefly to the translation of quotations from Latin and French and to the explanation of references and allusions with the aid of the *Britannica* and other obvious helps. If Palgrave's works are thought to deserve perpetuation as classics, which they are not, Bury's edition of the *Decline and Fall* would afford a better model of annotation. The freshest part of the volume is the prefatory memoir, with its numerous quotations from the letters of Sir Francis.

C. H. HASKINS.

*The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey.* Printed from the Original Manuscript in the British Museum. Edited by John Brownbill. Volume II., pt. III. [Remains Historical and Literary connected with the Palatine Counties of Lancaster and Chester, vol. LXXVIII., new series.] (Manchester, Chetham Society, 1919, pp. xxix, [295].) The contents of this volume are more varied in character than were the preceding installments of the Coucher Book. After the abbey rental with which it opens, come twenty-five pages of court rolls, some of the entries in which fur-

nish interesting sidelights on rural conditions in the early sixteenth century. Tenants are presented for keeping unringed swine; for selling bark and trees outside the lordship; and for driving their neighbors' sheep from the common pasture. A dog characterized as a "shepe-worwyer" is to be hanged; a tenant is ordered to remove his "unreasonable" mare from the common pasture; the possession and use of cards and dice is forbidden; while at the chapel of Colton no one shall have new ales, "nutterakes", "upsyttynges", or pots of ale on Saturdays or Sundays without special license.

The letters and petitions include regulations made in a chapter of the order in 1407 and an inquest on the death of Abbot Lawrence. Three monks conspired to murder him. They mixed poison with his ablutions at mass and afterwards gave him poisoned food.

The nine grants headed Manumissions and Transfers of Bondmen include transfers only; but as the editor points out, these may be round-about methods of manumission.

Evidence on the known right of the abbots of Furness to appoint a bishop to the Isle of Man is given in the Manx Documents (pp. 707-715), without, however, throwing new light on that obscure problem. A group of Irish charters relates with one exception to possessions of the abbey in and near Drogheda, and contains little of moment. These are followed by eighty pages of notes and additions to volume I., to meet the chief complaint against the late Canon Atkinson's editing.

The index of persons and places has proved accurate where I have tested it. If anything it is too complete: *e. g.*, Tunstal, Marmaduke, and Tunstal, Sir Marmaduke, are the same person.

ALFRED H. SWEET.

*The Immunity of Private Property from Capture at Sea.* By Harold Scott Quigley. [Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, no. 918. Economics and Political Science series, vol. IX., no. 2.] (Madison, the University, 1918, pp. 200, 25 cents.) Whether immunity of private property from capture at sea is destined to be relegated to the limbo of lost causes or not, the problem of re-shaping the law of the sea cannot be satisfactorily solved without the aid of careful investigations into the history of the struggle to shield commerce in time of war. The movement for immunity has always been bound up with the question of neutral rights, and as Dr. Quigley points out, has too frequently been confused with it. Neither can be understood without a careful retracing of the history of the law of capture. This task he has performed with scholarly thoroughness. Perhaps the most useful part of his dissertation is his summary of the opinions of publicists of different countries on the theory of immunity. The chapter on the treatment of private property at sea during the war just ended comes down to the summer of 1915, and is a markedly detached and unprejudiced examination of the methods for the control of commerce practised by the belligerent govern-

ments. He aligns himself with the school which believes the Declaration of Paris went too far ahead of the opinion of the times, and warns against any attempts at reform which fail to take account of the strength of the belief in the military importance of the destruction of enemy commerce.

LOUISE FARGO BROWN.

*Characters from the Histories and Memoirs of the Seventeenth Century, with an Essay on the Character, and Historical Notes.* By David Nichol Smith. (London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1918, pp. lii, 331, \$2.70.) Mr. Smith has an excellent idea, which, though not new, has produced an interesting book. The selection of a large group of "characters" from seventeenth-century English writings, preceded by an entertaining and informing essay on this species of literary expression, and supplemented by full and illuminating notes, all these witness the industry and knowledge of the compiler and contribute to the pleasure of the reader. No one can read such a collection without renewed interest in this most human and intimate of English centuries. Like those editors who have of late culled for us the choicer flowers of Raleigh and Clarendon, Mr. Smith has laid us under a debt of gratitude for what he has done. It seems the more ungrateful, therefore, to find fault with a volume which cannot fail to provide so much pleasure and profit for any one into whose hands it may come; yet we cannot but regret one obvious limitation. There is somewhat too much of Clarendon, who is honored with nearly as many selections as all other writers together. We could well spare some of these, good as they are, for a wider selection. Ludlow's evaluation of Cromwell, more of North and Aubrey, some of Evelyn and Pepys, and, above all perhaps, some of Sir William Monson's penetrating sketches, would have added variety and spice. Marvell's lines on Charles II., to take one instance of many, would have lightened a page; and there lie buried in the *Historical Manuscript Commission Reports* many lesser examples of an admirable art which might have lent sparkle to the greater jewels set here, if only by contrast of greater informality. Yet when so much is good, it ill becomes us to criticize too closely. There is not anywhere else in English so good an essay on the "character" as this; and though one might insist somewhat more than its accomplished author on the distinction between externals and intellectual or spiritual qualities, and their elucidation as exemplified in Clarendon and Burnet, he has said much on an interesting theme and said it well.

W. C. A.

*Le Cardinal Collier: Lettres et Prophéties de Marie-Thérèse; l'Em-bûche Autrichienne.* Par J. Munier-Jolain. (Paris, Payot et Cie., 1918, pp. 238, 4.50 fr.) In this little volume M. Munier-Jolain endeavors to broaden the setting in which the life of Cardinal de Rohan has been



placed by tradition and by the judgment of previous historians. He regards the Diamond Necklace affair as a mere incident in Rohan's life, and a minor incident but for its tragic consequences to Marie Antoinette. According to the author's view, Rohan is something more than a great noble of low character and inconceivable frivolity; he is a man of unusual mental gifts and far-reaching ambition. He does not deny the fact of Rohan's immoralities; on the contrary he adds new details. But he quotes testimony to Rohan's intellectual interests, his artistic tastes, his extraordinary alertness of mind. He also finds it hard to believe that even in an age of privilege and favor a fool should have been made honorary member of the French Academy, provisor of the Sorbonne, and grand almoner of France, to say nothing of the fact that he had been French ambassador at Vienna for two years and a half. He believes Rohan's goal was no less a position than that of chief minister of the king. Marie Antoinette stood in his way. She tried to prevent his being made grand almoner, but failed because of a promise the king had made to the cardinal's cousin, the Comtesse de Marsan. In his duel with the queen, Rohan lent himself to the libellers who were busy with her reputation. This conflict, which is supposed to furnish the larger setting to the cardinal's life, goes back in the author's opinion to the period of the embassy and to Rohan's discovery that Austria was to be faithless to the obligations of the French alliance by having a share in the first partition of Poland. Although Maria Theresa acknowledged that this was acting "à la Prussienne", M. Munier-Jolain thinks she conceived an intense enmity for Rohan because he warned Louis XV. what was impending. But if her enmity had this origin, is it not strange that the Emperor Joseph and the minister Kaunitz remained on intimate terms with Rohan, for they, more than she, were responsible for the Austrian policy concerning Poland? Interesting as the author's account of the "Cardinal Collier" is, his argument is not convincing. Rohan's conduct was so habitually crooked, and his wickedness so vulgar, that it is impossible to believe him a man of superior powers.

H. E. B.

*Un Impôt sur le Revenu sous la Révolution: Histoire de la "Contribution Patriotique" dans le Bas-Languedoc (Département de l'Hérault), 1789-1795, d'après des Documents Inédits.* Par Pierre-Edm. Hugues. Préface de M. Paul Delombre. (Paris, Édouard Champion, 1919, pp. lxxvii, 330, 9.50 fr.) The "Contribution Patriotique" has hitherto interested students of the French Revolution chiefly because its proposal offered Mirabeau an opportunity to discredit Necker. Its success was doubtful, but money must be had, and there was little time for discussion. Mirabeau, accordingly, urged that the National Assembly accept "de confiance" the minister's project of an extraordinary income-tax. If it failed Necker would be responsible and his popularity would receive a deadly blow. But the tax has a more interesting side as a feature of

Revolutionary financiering and as an incident in the history of income-taxes. With our own success of recent memory in raising huge sums by taking high percentages of large incomes, it is curious to follow the fate of a tax which took in three annual installments 25 per cent. of each income over 400 livres. This meant only 8½ per cent. a year. Neither Necker nor the Assembly dared in the beginning to inaugurate effective means of controlling the returns. They relied, or pretended to rely, on the patriotism of each citizen to impel him to make a true declaration of the amount due. If he wished to conceal his exact income he could subscribe more than 25 per cent. and declare that his subscription exceeded the required sum. M. Hugues describes in minute detail the experience with the tax in the department of L'Hérault, formerly Bas-Languedoc. He shows that the tax was eventually collected, although the returns were not all in before the close of the Convention. The later installments were paid in depreciated assignats. One of the first obstacles was the change in the system of local government, but the permanent and serious obstacle was the inertia of the rural communes and of the "petit peuple" in general. They supposed the Revolution meant deliverance from taxation, not new taxes. Before many months were gone, the Assembly was obliged to introduce coercion and to impose upon the local authorities the duty of fixing the sum to be paid by those who neglected to make declarations and of increasing amounts declared if these were obviously too small. The "Contribution Patriotique" did not save the country from Mirabeau's "hideous bankruptcy"; it did not even discredit Necker, for he disappeared long before its failure was evident. Its chief interest, in the opinion of the author, is in the illustrations it offers of the inherent difficulties of income-tax legislation. Altogether, this work is an important addition to our knowledge of the financial history of the Revolution.

H. E. BOURNE.

*The Religious Policy of the Bavarian Government during the Napoleonic Period.* By Chester Penn Higby, Instructor in History, West Virginia University. [Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, vol. LXXXV., no. 1, whole no. 196.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1919, pp. 346, \$3.00.) This painstaking doctoral dissertation does not attempt to prove any novel thesis, but simply to answer in scholarly fashion three questions. What were the religious and political conditions in Bavaria at the death of the Elector Charles Theodore in 1799? What changes were wrought by his successor, Maximilian IV., from 1799 to 1815? To what extent were these changes permanent? In answer he finds that in 1799 the conglomerate of territories which made up the electorate was overrun with beggars, tramps, and criminals, in spite of the medieval barbarity and frequency of the penal executions. The Roman Catholic clergy were intolerant, superstitious, possessed of considerable lands, and all-powerful politically. Innumerable popular

superstitions prevailed, such as the ringing of church-bells to avert thunderstorms. But, nevertheless, conditions were not quite as gloomy and medieval as they have been commonly painted. From 1799 to 1815, under the beneficent Maximilian IV. and his enlightened minister, Montgelas, came sweeping reforms. Lutherans and Calvinists, though not Jews, were put on an equality with Catholics. Church lands, both of monasteries and cathedral chapters, were secularized. The Catholic hierarchy were subordinated to the control of the state. And the government attempted, though unsuccessfully, to stamp out many of the superstitious practices by edicts regulating the religious life of the people; the government was unwisely trying to accomplish by legislation a task which should have been left to education. After the downfall of Napoleon, and in spite of general reaction, most of the reform measures in Bavaria were permanently preserved, and many were embodied in the Concordat of 1817, which has survived for a century. The secularization policy, however, was reversed, and in the eighteen-twenties and thirties many of the confiscated lands were restored to the monks and nuns, so that in 1904 they numbered respectively 1985 and 12,586, as compared with 3281 and 1238 a century earlier in 1802. The war prevented the author from making any investigations in manuscript material in Bavaria, but we doubt if this results in any very serious loss; for he has made excellent use of all the topographical and descriptive works, the memoirs, and the laws of Bavaria available in the libraries of this country. What he does not explain, but what we should like to know, is what were the underlying causes of the reform movement. Was it the permeating effect of French eighteenth-century philosophy, or the striking example of the French Revolution, or the pressure of Napoleonic influence, or simply the chance fact that Maximilian IV. happened to be progressive and tolerant, while Charles Theodore had been the reverse? One gathers that it was the latter chance of fate, though a part of the reform legislation, especially after 1802, was due to Napoleonic influence.

S. B. F.

*The Congress of Vienna, 1814-15.* By C. K. Webster, Professor of Modern History in the University of Liverpool. (London, Humphrey Milford, for the Historical Section of the Foreign Office, 1919, pp. xii, 174, 4 sh. 6 d.) This is "one of a series of handbooks on countries and subjects likely to come under discussion during the peace negotiations", which have been edited under the general supervision of Dr. G. W. Prothero by the historical section of the British foreign office with the aid of expert scholars. Intended "for the information of officials and men of action rather than historians", it was written under pressure in eleven weeks during the summer of 1918; and the author modestly describes it as "purely a *pièce de circonstance*", and promises a larger work on the same subject after his release from governmental service. Nevertheless, it is a work of much merit, and until the appearance of a

definitive history of the Congress of Vienna historians will welcome it as the partial fulfillment of a long-felt need. The author has made extensive use of the heretofore somewhat neglected papers of the British foreign office, and it is evident that he has been a student of the problems about which he writes for a much longer period than was taken up with the actual preparation of this little volume. His point of view is frankly British. To many it will seem too exclusively British. He believes that England's diplomatic rôle in 1814-1815 has hitherto received less than its due share of attention; and accordingly he has set forth the course of British foreign policy under Castlereagh's direction in these critical years with considerable fullness. Of Castlereagh he holds that "it has been clearly proved that for courage and common sense he has rarely been equalled among British diplomatists, and that his influence over the settlement of 1814-1815 was greater than that of any other European statesman".

✓ *The Century of Hope: a Sketch of Western Progress from 1815 to the Great War.* By F. S. Marvin. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1919, pp. vii, 352, \$3.00.) Mr. Marvin has made a laudable attempt to sketch the intellectual history of Europe during the nineteenth century. This is a tribute to the new spirit of history which seeks for explanations, not merely in political mechanisms nor in economic determinism, but also in human ideals and emotions. The book lacks unity, perhaps because the subject does. The reader is frequently left floundering but happy, very much in the same mood as when he hears an engaging lecturer discourse for an hour on some world problem. There are chapters on democracy, literature, socialism, science (by far the best), nationalism, imperialism, education, religion, and social progress. The bibliography contains lists of good, bad, and indifferent books, but without any indication of their relative merits.

*Bayern und Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert.* Von M. Doeberl. (Munich, K. B. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1917, pp. 155.) The author of this brochure occupied himself for many years with the history of Bavaria in the nineteenth century, particularly in its relations to the politics of larger Germany. Numerous studies and articles from his hand have appeared from time to time dealing with special persons and policies, so that the theme is in a measure a rapid glance over the process by which Bavaria came into the German Empire, the actual essay being condensed into fifty pages.

Certain basic principles or motives have been at the foundation of Bavarian politics. The most fundamental has been the consciousness of a South-German distinctiveness, or national sentiment, based on a long dynastic history and not including a love for Prussians. Naturally royal families and royal statesmen were anxious to preserve their dignities and the position of the state to as great a degree as possible. Yet the

Bavarian kings of the last century were for the most part imbued with the sense of German unity. Both Ludwig I. and Ludwig II. surpassed their local statesmen in this respect. The balance of these two motives succeeded in obtaining for Bavaria a superior position, or at least the outward marks of greater independence, in the construction of the empire of 1870. To this well-known outline of facts the author contributes the story of the internal politics by which those ends were achieved.

Another fundamental theme lies in the close ties of sentiment and economic relationship between Bavaria and German Austria. These instincts led nearly to conflict with Prussia in 1866, and to attempts at various previous times to form a separate South-German federation. Writing in 1917, the author sees a wonderful realization of this natural unity in the combination of Germany and Austria against Europe. To those who now or in the future will have to settle the adjustment of nationalities these affinities may have great importance.

The article is fortified with more than a hundred pages of selected state papers taken from the archives and correspondence of Bavaria and other German states, and covering the period from 1814 to 1870.

J. M. VINCENT.

*Catalogue of Materials in the Archivo General de Indias for the History of the Pacific Coast and the American Southwest.* By Charles E. Chapman, Assistant Professor of History in the University of California. [University of California Publications in History, vol. VII.] (Berkeley, the University, 1919, pp. v, 755, \$5.50.) This volume is the result of the labors of Professor Chapman, while holding a "Native Sons fellowship" of the University of California, and is a credit to his scholarship. The work is compiled from an examination of 207 *legajos* selected from the Papeles de Estado and Audiencia (Guadalajara and Mexico) groups of the Archives of the Indies as most likely to contain materials for California history. About five per cent. of the documents of these *legajos* have entered into the calendar. Although the *Catalogue* does not give a complete list for the regions indicated, it serves to demonstrate the richness of the documentation of the Archives of the Indies for the history of California and the southwestern United States. The entries of the calendar cover the period from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries inclusive. For the earlier years, the materials include the southwestern United States in a larger sense, while in the later period they are limited more strictly to California and the approaches thereto.

An excellent introduction gives an account of the Archives of the Indies, a statement regarding the work of the Native Sons fellows, a summary of the work accomplished by the author, and an explanation of the system used in making the calendar. Part I. contains a summary description of the 207 selected *legajos*, described either singly or in

groups. Part II. forms the bulk of the volume and comprises a calendar of 6257 items, representing perhaps 20,000 separate documents. The content of the documents is usually indicated by the official summary taken from the document itself, which gives a satisfactory idea of its character. The calendar has already served in the preparation of the author's *Founding of Spanish California* and of Priestley's *José de Gálvez*. In addition the author declares that the calendar contains available data for fifty other works, relating to discovery, exploration, settlement, administration (civil, military, financial, and ecclesiastical), etc., of Spanish California and the southwestern United States.

Little criticism can be offered of Professor Chapman's book. The technical term "Calendar" instead of "Catalogue" in the title would fit the contents better. Placing the numbers of the documents before the entry instead of after it gives them undue prominence. A few slight errors have crept in but they are mostly obvious. The *Catalogue* is a worthy and useful addition to the series of publications of the University of California.

ROSCOE R. HILL.

*Early Records of the City and County of Albany and Colony of Rensselaerwyck.* Volumes III. and IV. Translated from the Original Dutch by Jonathan Pearson, late Professor of Natural Philosophy in Union College. Revised and Edited by A. J. F. van Laer, Archivist, Division of Archives and History. [New York State Library, History Bulletins, nos. 10, 11]. (Albany, University of the State of New York, 1918, 1919, pp. 644, 200). The present volumes, like the preceding two (see this journal, XXII. 444), consist of translations of Dutch records in the Albany county clerk's office. Volume III., *Notarial Papers, 1660-1669*, contains those of the Albany notaries, Dirck van Schelluyne, Adriaen Jansen van Ilpendam, and Jan Juriaensen Becker, who, under the practice of the period, had recording as well as attesting functions and whose registers contain the original documents executed before them. These consist of powers of attorney, contracts relating to both real and personal property, bonds, settlements of accounts and estates, assignments of debts and inheritances, agreements and certificates of apprenticeship, witnesses' depositions, wills, a few deeds and other miscellaneous papers; a number of van Ilpendam's letters are included. Volume IV. is divided into two parts. The first (pp. 7-115) under the general title *Mortgages, 1658-1660*, contains some fifteen mortgages, a number of deeds, contracts for the sale of real and personal property, bonds, powers of attorney, several depositions, the terms of sale at auction of various pieces of real property, of which there are many, and some miscellaneous papers. Part 2 (pp. 117-206) contains wills beginning July 5, 1681, but principally from October 8, 1691, to 1782; only those originally in Dutch are given, but subscribing witnesses' depositions and records of probate, which are in English, are included.

The very description of these papers indicates their large value for local social, economic, and administrative history; for genealogical and biographical purposes they furnish a vast fund of hitherto practically inaccessible information. Volume III. contains not only the greater bulk and variety of documents but its earlier portion has an added importance because the manuscript minutes of the local court at Albany for the period 1660-1668 are wanting.

The work is done with the customary and well-recognized care and thoroughness of the editor; the annotations are many and helpful; the translations show the benefit of his exceptional qualifications for the task.

S. G. NISSENSON.

*James Madison's Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 and their Relation to a More Perfect Society of Nations.* By James Brown Scott, Technical Delegate of the United States to the Second Hague Peace Conference. (New York and London, Oxford University Press, 1918, pp. xviii, 149, \$2.00.) The scope of this monograph is defined by the latter part of its title. It is not a discussion of Madison's notes in full, but only of such portions of his record of the Convention's debates as may have direct application upon the constitution of a League of Nations. In brief, the author's point of view is that the Convention of 1787 was "in fact as well as in form an international conference". For this reason, he is "firmly convinced that the proceedings of the Convention are therefore of interest in this day of international conferences". Hence, should the Society of Nations decide to strengthen the bonds which unite them, these notes "should be mastered and the experience of the United States under the more perfect union be taken into consideration".

Following a brief but illuminating introduction, Dr. Scott reviews those portions of Madison's notes which deal with problems analogous to those presented by the international situation of to-day. Thus, he points out in detail how the "two sets of difficulties—namely, equality and local interests—seemingly insurmountable then, and still peculiarly significant to international conferences", were solved. The relation of justiciable to political questions, and the important and unique function the Supreme Court has filled in our country are emphasized. "It offers the nations a model and a hope of judicial settlement of their controversies" which otherwise "can only be settled by war".

Within the limits that Dr. Scott has set himself, his work has been admirably done. It was scarcely to be expected that anything new to the specialist in regard to the work of the Convention would be brought to light. It is rather in his application of the lessons which the successful experience of the union of the states presents to the nations of the world that the author has made his chief contribution.

It may be remarked, however, in conclusion that unfortunately the



covenant of the new League of Nations does not indicate that these lessons were drawn upon to any marked extent by the five great powers.

HERMAN V. AMES.

*Life and Letters of Simeon Baldwin.* By Simeon E. Baldwin. (New Haven, the Author, 1919, pp. ix, 503, \$3.50.) This book is a compilation from letters and journals, published "with the special view of introducing an ancestor to his remote descendants, and the general view of picturing the life and manners of a former generation". These modest aims have been amply fulfilled by the distinguished author, who allows his ancestor to reveal his own character and tell his own story. Simeon Baldwin (1761-1851) was the youngest of eight children of a farmer in Norwich, Connecticut. An education at Yale gave him the pass-key to the Connecticut hierarchy. For many years he was content to practise law in New Haven, and play Federalist politics from the inside. In 1803 he was sent to Congress, but two years' residence at Washington in that harvest season for democracy made him "more and more satisfied with the mediocrity of the Connecticut style of living" (p. 345). He refused a re-election, and accepted a seat on the supreme bench of his native commonwealth, where he would undoubtedly have passed the remainder of his long life but for the local political upheaval of 1818.

Simeon Baldwin was a fairly typical Connecticut Federalist, sharing every opinion and prejudice of his class. Occasional flashes of discernment are found in his letters. He criticizes the Federalists for their Johnsonian methods of argument and tactless sarcasm (p. 393); he wishes sectionalism to be called by its right name in 1813, and not disguised as Federalism (p. 459). Nothing new or startling, but much illustrative material, is contained in his correspondence. The first half of the book, covering Baldwin's undergraduate life and tutorship at Yale, is a good supplement to Ezra Stiles's diary of the same depressed period in the history of the college. After Shays's Rebellion, Baldwin's friend Dr. Backus is frankly monarchist (pp. 386-389). The letters of Elizur Goodrich and James Hillhouse are a contribution to the literature of ultra-Federalism. A confidential circular of a state Federalist committee in 1804 (p. 290) confirms the reviewer's opinion that the New England Federalists had a political machine which for silent effectiveness equalled anything manipulated by modern bosses. At Washington, Baldwin was not let into the secession plot of 1804, but his letters give entertaining accounts of the impeachment of Chase, the manners of John Randolph, and the dress of Betsy Bonaparte. The author has also wisely included material on the banking and canal enterprises in which his ancestor engaged, and has shown us how one could live comfortably in New Haven on an income less than \$1100 a year—before 1851.

S. E. MORISON.

*Centennial History of Moses Brown School, 1819-1919.* By Rayner Wickersham Kelsey, Associate Professor of History in Haverford College. With an Introduction by Rufus Matthew Jones, Professor of Philosophy in Haverford College. (Providence, Moses Brown School, 1919, pp. xviii, 178, \$2.00.) An attractive book, printed on good paper, illustrated with thirty-seven inserted pages of cuts, and worthy in every way of the dignified institution it describes.

A noteworthy feature of the book is the loving touch of the author. In his preface he speaks of his gratitude for the privilege of doing the work, and of the inspiration of communion through the channels of history with the ancient worthies who founded the school. That the devotion is sincere the volume sufficiently attests. Few schools are so fortunate in their interpreters.

The early chapters deal with colonial times and the beginnings of our school systems. The Quakers early advocated the founding of schools, and had in operation in England by 1671 at least fifteen boarding schools. The Friends' Public School in Philadelphia, now the William Penn Charter School, was founded in 1689. As early as 1684 the Rhode Island Friends granted the use of a meeting-house in Newport for a school, and promised what assistance they could give. A hundred years later the New England Friends established and maintained for four years in Portsmouth, Rhode Island, the predecessor of the present Moses Brown School. A copy of the rules and regulations of that school is given in an appendix, dated November 1, 1784, and reflects the intense seriousness of the times.

That the present school came into being was largely the work of the Moses Brown of historic fame, who continued as its treasurer until the year of his death, at the age of ninety-seven, in 1836.

Among the later workers for the prosperity of the school were the Smiley brothers, later of Lake Mohonk, from whose administration the financial success of the school seems to have dated. Albert K. Smiley was principal of the school from 1860 to 1879, and for much of the time his brother Alfred was associated with him.

The entire book is replete with humor and will prove of interest even to those who do not know the school. It forms a valuable contribution to the literature of the formation of our secondary schools.

As a minor matter, a Rhode Islander naturally takes exception to the author's use of the commonly accepted statement that this state in educational matters was more backward during the colonial period than other New England states. Dr. Carroll in his *Public Education in Rhode Island* (1918) has shown that this impression has doubtless grown from the fact that, although this state had the schools, it did not have the laws requiring the schools to be established. He even claims a reasonable probability that Newport was the first town in all English America to establish a public school.

JOHN L. ALGER.

*James Baird Weaver.* By Fred Emory Haynes. [Iowa Biographical series, edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh.] (Iowa City, State Historical Society, 1919, pp. xv, 494, \$2.00.) The influence of James B. Weaver was in the field of agitation. He never held an important administrative post or served as a member of a controlling group of Congress. He was never tested and seasoned by political responsibility. Instead of these experiences, which might have made of him a real national figure, he lived the life of the prophet of marginal reforms. Less unpractical and dogmatic than many of his associates, he was not the less a persistent member of that group that Colonel Roosevelt characterized so aptly as the "fringe of lunatics".

The three decades after the Civil War were relatively barren of constructive political and social leadership, so far as the great parties were concerned. What programme of betterment there was, was offered only outside the party organizations. Much of the programme was lop-sided, and was condemned by contemporaries because of the greenback and silver panaceas that accompanied it. But it is true, as Dr. Haynes emphasizes more than once, that in the half-seen vision of the Greenback-Farmers' Alliance-Populist leaders were the suggestions of much that has to-day become orthodox and commonplace. Weaver could not see the intermediate steps, but he was strong on foreseeing goals and ideals—or guessing at them. Twice, as presidential candidate in 1880 and 1892, he was official spokesman for the discontented. The critique of Dr. Haynes makes little attempt to show how much of Weaver's foresight was rational and how much was mere accident.

Dr. Haynes's biography will be a useful addition to the literature of politics, but it contains relatively little that will be new to the intimate student. Weaver's manuscript remains were not important. His biography makes of necessity a sad contrast with such a work as Caro Lloyd's *Henry Demarest Lloyd*. Weaver "gave little thought to the past", and "he looked forward to the very end of his life". A single scrapbook and a letter-file contain all that he preserved for his biographer. With the scanty assistance of these, and with the *Congressional Record* and the Iowa newspapers, Dr. Haynes has done his best, and has traversed again much of the ground covered in his *Third Party Movements since the Civil War*. His foot-notes show that he has consulted the Weller Papers in the Wisconsin Historical Society, and the Donnelley Papers in the Minnesota Historical Society, both of which are rich collections for the Greenback and Populist movements. But he does not appear to have exhausted these papers, or to have enriched his text to the fullest from them.

The book is of course beautifully printed and carefully annotated.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

*A Report on the Public Archives.* By Theodore C. Blegen. [Wisconsin Historical Publications, Bulletin of Information, no. 94.] (Madi-

son, *State Historical Society*, 1918, pp. 115.) This well-considered and carefully-written pamphlet is one of the most encouraging signs of the times. It is a study, in the light of the best European and American practice and precept, of the problem of dealing with the public records of Wisconsin. It may occasion some surprise to learn that, in the matter of caring for its archives, Wisconsin is hardly abreast of Massachusetts and is considerably behind Iowa and Alabama, but such is the case. The State Historical Society, turning its attention to this state of affairs, commissioned Mr. Blegen to make a report on the general situation and to suggest a plan for the better organization and administration of the public records. Mr. Blegen first made a study of the archival practices of certain foreign countries, especially England and Canada, and of a few of the American states, such as Iowa, Mississippi, and Pennsylvania. The best practice he found to be based on three fundamental principles: "(1) the centralization of all archives not in current use; (2) an efficient and scientific classification and general administration of the records thus centralized; (3) the custody of the archives under officials thoroughly trained, both in theory and in practice, for their work". In the application of these principles to the situation in Wisconsin Mr. Blegen urges the erection of a special building to serve as an archive depot, and the organization of an archive administration under the State Historical Society, already the trustee of the state for all its historical interests. It is to be hoped that Mr. Blegen's recommendations will be adopted for they are clearly in accordance with the best archival practice and would meet the demands of administrative efficiency and historical scholarship.

WALDO G. LELAND.

## HISTORICAL NEWS

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The American Historical Association will hold its annual meeting in Cleveland on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, December 29, 30, and 31. The committee on the programme will use as much of the programme prepared for 1918, and abandoned on account of the influenza, as seems practicable. Certain subjects and the entire session on the War Issues Course will be dropped because the end of the war has destroyed the interest in them. The conference of history teachers arranged for last year will be superseded by a session devoted to the report of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools. Conferences are being organized for those interested in Latin-American history, economic history, ancient and medieval history, the Far East, the Russian Revolution, American colonial history, American nationalism, and modern European history. One or two sessions will present the historical background of some of the boundary problems which have been before the Peace Congress in Paris. The papers of the Latin-American conference will be mainly concerned with the attitude of the Latin-American people toward the Monroe Doctrine, of the modern European history group with the historical background of some of the problems of reconstruction which now claim attention. There will be joint sessions with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and with the Political Science Association, which will meet in Cleveland at the same time; the usual conference of historical societies will also take place.

Proof of the *Annual Report* for 1917 has been read and the indexes are being prepared. Vol. II. of the *Annual Report* for 1918, being the autobiography of Martin Van Buren, went to press in July. Vol. I. of that Report, with contents of the usual sort, but including also a considerable body of material on agricultural history submitted by the Agricultural History Society, has gone to the press more recently.

The Association offers a prize of \$250 for the best unpublished essay in American military history submitted to the Military Prize Committee before July 1, 1920. The essay may treat of any events of American military history—a war, a campaign, a battle, the influence of a diplomatic or political situation upon military operations, an arm of the service, the fortunes of a particular command, a method of warfare historically treated, the career of a distinguished soldier. It should not be highly technical in character, but it must be a positive contribution to historical knowledge, and the fruit of original research. For further

information address the chairman, Professor Milledge L. Bonham, jr., Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

#### NATIONAL BOARD OF HISTORICAL SERVICE

With respect to the large series of extracts from the German newspapers bearing on the history of the war, which were mentioned on page 747 of our July issue, it is perhaps best to mention specifically the names of the libraries in which sets of these transcripts may be found: the Library of Congress, and those of Vassar College, Princeton University, and the universities of Michigan, Chicago, and Wisconsin.

#### PERSONAL

Archdeacon William Cunningham, president of the Royal Historical Society from 1910 to 1913, died recently at the age of 69. He was one of the foremost pioneers of economic history in England, was well known in the United States, and was a man of most genial character. His *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* has been widely read and used.

Rev. John Neville Figgis, honorary fellow of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge, friend and editor of Lord Acton, died suddenly on April 13, at the age of 53. He is best known by his essay on the *Divine Right of Kings* (1896) and by his *Studies of Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius* (1907).

Don Eduardo de Hinojosa y Naveros, member of the Spanish Academy, permanent secretary of the Royal Academy of History, and a distinguished writer on Spanish legal history, died at Madrid on May 19.

In memory of a son killed in action during the war, Lord Rothermere has founded at Cambridge a well-endowed chair of naval history. The chair has been filled by the appointment of Dr. J. Holland Rose. A chair of Byzantine Greek and history has been established at Oxford, chairs of imperial history, of Russian history, and of modern Greek history at the University of London. To the last two chairs respectively, Sir Bernard Pares and Mr. Arnold Toynbee have been elected. The vacancy caused at Manchester by the retirement of Professor James Tait has been filled by the election of Mr. F. M. Powicke.

Mr. A. Percival Newton, lecturer in imperial and colonial history in the University of London and secretary of the London branch of the American Historical Association, spends October, November, and December in the United States, and lectures at various American universities on subjects connected with the history of the British Empire.

Assistant-professor R. M. Johnston of Harvard University has been promoted to be professor of modern history.

Messrs. Ernest Barker and R. H. Tawney of New College, Oxford, are to teach in Amherst College, the former during the second term, the latter during the third term, of the present academic year.

In Yale University, Dr. Frank W. Pitman has been promoted to the position of assistant professor of history in the Sheffield Scientific School.

Professor Henry Johnson of Teachers' College, Columbia University, has leave of absence during the present academic year.

To a new chair of history founded at Cornell University by Mr. John Stambaugh of Youngstown, the trustees of that institution have elected Professor George L. Burr. Professor Burr has a sabbatical year of vacation which will mainly be spent upon the papers of the late President White and upon an unfinished book of the late Henry C. Lea.

Professor Milledge L. Bonham, jr., has accepted an appointment as professor of history in Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

Dr. Henry R. Shipman has been promoted from assistant professor to associate professor of history in Princeton University.

Professor R. P. Brooks, though he has withdrawn from the University of Georgia, and is now associated with a bank in Macon, expects to finish before long the volume of Calhoun Papers which he is editing for the Historical Manuscripts Commission. He also expects to complete the life of Howell Cobb on which he has been working for a number of years.

Dr. Percy S. Flippin has been appointed professor of history in Mercer University, Macon, Ga.

Professor H. C. Hockett has been granted a leave of absence from his duties as professor of American history in the Ohio State University for the year 1919-1920. Dr. C. S. Boucher, hitherto of Washington University, has been appointed assistant professor of American history. Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger of Ohio State University has been made head of the department of history in the State University of Iowa. Dr. Wilmer C. Harris, of the same institution, has been appointed head of the department of history at Butler College.

Professor Isaac J. Cox of Cincinnati has accepted a call to Northwestern University as professor of Hispanic-American history. Dr. Reginald C. McGrane becomes assistant professor of American history in the University of Cincinnati. Professor Merrick Whitcomb having a year's leave of absence, his work at Cincinnati is temporarily taken by Mr. Raymond Chambers.



Professor Arthur H. Hirsch of Morningside College has been elected head of the department of history in Ohio Wesleyan University in succession to Professor R. T. Stevenson.

In the University of Illinois, Mr. Rexford Newcomb, who last year, as assistant professor of architecture, took charge of the classes in architectural history, carried for over forty years by Dr. Nathan C. Ricker, has been made assistant professor of architectural history.

In the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Mr. Louis B. Schmidt has been promoted from associate professor in charge of history to professor of history, Mr. Albert B. Moore from instructor to assistant professor of history.

Dr. N. A. N. Cleves has been appointed assistant professor of history and political science in the University of Arkansas.

Professor Edward M. Hulme of the University of Idaho has been granted a year's leave of absence for the purpose of study in Europe.

Mr. Joseph V. Fuller has been called as assistant professor of European history to give courses in the University of California on recent European, including especially Slavic, history.

In Stanford University Professor Edward Krehbiel is acting executive of the department of history in the absence of Professor E. D. Adams, who has been granted leave of absence for a journey to Europe. Dr. Yamato Ichihashi has been granted leave for a year's study in Japan.

#### GENERAL

More than a quarter-century has elapsed since Professors Lavissee and Rambaud began the publication of the admirable *Histoire Générale du IV<sup>e</sup> Siècle à nos Jours*. A similar work on a more extended scale, covering in twenty volumes the whole period from ancient times to the present, is now announced, to be prepared under the editorial direction of Professors Halphen and Sagnac with the collaboration of a large group of scholars. The publisher will be Alcan of Paris.

A conference of representatives of the war history commissions and similar organizations of some fifteen states, together with representatives of various governmental offices having important war records, was held in Washington on September 9 and 10. In addition to discussing problems of the collecting of materials in the various states and to exchanging views and the results of experience, the conference founded an organization to be known as the National Association of State War History Organizations, the members of which are to be the officially recognized agencies in each state for the collection and preservation of its war records. The association will maintain, at joint expense, a

bureau in Washington for the purpose of locating, describing, and copying the documents in the governmental archives and other central depositories which bear upon the war activities of the several states. Steps have already been taken to organize this bureau and to compile a comprehensive survey of the various bodies of war records in Washington. The new association is to hold an annual meeting in Washington each year, in April; the first general meeting will be held at Cleveland during the last three days in December in connection with the meetings of the American Historical Association. The officers and executive committee for the first year have been chosen as follows: president, James Sullivan, state historian of New York; vice-president, Arthur K. Davis, chairman of the Virginia War History Commission; secretary-treasurer, Albert E. McKinley, secretary of the Pennsylvania War History Commission; additional members of the executive committee, Franklin F. Holbrook, secretary of the Minnesota War Records Commission, and Benjamin F. Shambaugh, superintendent of the State Historical Society of Iowa.

In the June number of the *Historical Outlook*, Dr. J. G. Randall, special expert of the United States Shipping Board, sets forth some of the War Tasks and Accomplishments of the Shipping Board; Professor E. L. Bogart discusses the Money Costs of the War; Professor L. M. Larson a Few Territorial Problems confronting the Peace Conference, and Mr. Thomas W. Gosling a New Internationalism.

The (English) Historical Association's *Annual Bulletin of Historical Literature* for 1918, to be obtained from the secretary of the society, is for the most part confined to the important English publications of the year, but the section on ancient history, by Mr. Norman H. Baynes, has additional value as surveying the year's publications in various languages. A full bibliography of the articles on Roman history which have appeared in periodicals, prepared by the same competent writer, will appear in the next issue of *The Year's Work*, published by the Classical Association.

The S. P. C. K. series of *Helps for Students of History*, mentioned heretofore in these pages (XXIV. 313, 750) has been taken over for publication in this country by the Macmillan Company. Recent additions to this useful series of pamphlets are two by Mr. Arthur Tilley on *The French Wars of Religion* and *The French Renaissance*; *Hints on the Study of English Economic History*, by the late Archdeacon Cunningham; *Parish History and Records*, by A. H. Thompson; and an *Introduction to the Study of Colonial History*, by Dr. A. Percival Newton. Volumes rather than pamphlets, on *The Period of Congresses* (pp. 200) and *Securities of Peace: a Retrospect, 1848-1914* (pp. 126), are contributed by the Master of Peterhouse, Sir Adolphus W. Ward.

The Norwegian Nobel Institute announces an international prize essay contest on "The History of the Free Trade Movement in the

Nineteenth Century and the Bearings of that Movement on International Peace". Essays may be submitted in English, French, German, or any of the Scandinavian languages. The author of the successful essay will receive the sum of 5000 Norwegian crowns (say \$1350); the monograph will become the property of the Institute. Essays, bearing an epigraph and accompanied by a sealed envelope containing the name of the author, must be sent to the Norwegian Nobel Institute, 19 Drammensvei, Christiania, before July 1, 1922.

*The Spread of Christianity in the Modern World* (University of Chicago Press), by Professor Edward C. Moore of Harvard, depicts the missionary movement against the background of general history since the middle of the eighteenth century.

*The Evolution of the Dragon* (Manchester University Press) by Professor G. Elliot Smith embodies a new theory of the origin of myths. "Dragons" are merely a link in the author's argument, which is a denial of the possibility that similar beliefs and customs develop independently among separate peoples.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Joël, *Vernunft und Geschichte* (Neue Rundschau, April, 1916); R. Hubert, *La Philosophie de l'Histoire et les Événements du Temps Présent* (Revue de Paris, June 15).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago undertakes this winter an archaeological survey of Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, including both Babylonia and Assyria, under the general direction of Professor James H. Breasted, the purpose of the survey being to determine what archaeological opportunities have been opened to the western world by the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, and what obligations in this region should be met by American resources.

P. Karge has published an extended work entitled *Rephaim, Die Vorgeschichtliche Kultur Palästinas und Phöniziens, Archäologische und Religionsgeschichtliche Studien* (Paderborn, Schöningh, 1918, pp. xv, 765).

*The Annual of the British School at Athens* (Macmillan), sessions of 1916-1917 and 1917-1918, is made up of miscellaneous papers, including a discussion of the battle of Mantinea by Mr. Woodhouse, a study of the sources and the text of Strabo, by Dr. Leaf and Dr. van Buren, a hitherto unpublished letter of Lord Byron written from Athens in 1811, and an account by Mr. Wace of Frank Hastings and George Finlay, two less celebrated friends of Greek liberty.

The most recent volume by Professor Eduard Meyer is *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus: Innere Geschichte Roms von 66 bis 44 v. Chr.* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1918, pp. x, 627).

*Local Government in Ancient India* is the title of a volume recently published (Clarendon Press) in the series of *Mysore University Studies*. The author, Radhakumud Mookerji, is professor of history in the university.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. H. Breasted, *The Place of the Near Orient in the Career of Man and the Task of the American Orientalist* (Journal of the American Oriental Society, XXXIX.); A. Rosenberg, *Zur Geschichte des Latinerbundes* (Hermes, LIV. 2).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

*The Primitive Tradition of the Eucharistic Body and Blood*, by Rev. Lucius Waterman, rector of St. Thomas's Church, Hanover, N. H. (Longmans, Green, and Co.), embodies a series of lectures delivered at the General Theological Seminary of the American Episcopal Church in 1918 and 1919.

In one of its series of translations of Christian literature, the series dealing with liturgical texts, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has published a translation of the *Pilgrimage of Etheria*, the letter-diary of an abbess of the fourth century, who writes to the nuns of her house, probably in Spain, of her travels in Egypt, Palestine, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor, with descriptions of churches and services she attended.

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Mrs. Charles Singer of Oxford is compiling a catalogue of the medieval scientific manuscripts in the British Isles. The work, which has received grants from both the Royal Society and the British Academy, already comprises more than 40,000 entries.

E. Stein deals mainly with the reigns of Justin II. and Tiberius Constantinus, the immediate successors of Justinian I., in his volume of *Studien zur Geschichte des Byzantinischen Reiches* (Stuttgart, Metzler, 1918, pp. viii, 200).

The volume of critical studies by B. Schmeidler entitled *Hamburg-Bremen und Nordost-Europa vom 9. bis 11. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1918, pp. xix, 363) includes a critique of the chronicle of Adam of Bremen and other studies relating to the historical origins of the Hanseatic regions.

*The Tournament: its Periods and Phases* is the title of a volume by R. Coltman Clephan, published by Methuen. The history of this form of sport in England and Europe is studied, as well as trials by combat, duels, and modern revivals of the tournament.

M. Paul Sabatier intends to bring out before long volumes VIII.-XIII. of his *Collection d'Études et de Documents* relative to St. Francis,

of which seven volumes had appeared before the war. Vol. VIII. will contain a critical edition of the *Speculum Perfectionis*; vol. IX., a critical examination of the same; vol. X., a critical edition of the *Legenda Trium Sociorum*; vol. XI., the *Legenda Vetust*; vol. XII., sources for the life of St. Francis; vol. XIII., a general index to the whole series of the *Collection*, and to the three volumes (the third now in press) of the *Opuscles de Critique Historique*. He also announces an extensively revised second edition of his celebrated *Vie de St. François* (1893).

A careful biographical study of *Papst Hadrian V. (Kardinal Ottobuono Fieschi)* (Heidelberg, Winter, 1916, pp. viii, 360) has been written by Natalie Schöpf. Hadrian V. was a Genoese whose pontificate extended over but a few weeks in 1276. His mission to England from 1265 to 1268 was the most important episode of his career.

The French School at Rome has recently published in the series *Registres Pontificaux* (Paris, Boccard) additional sections of the registers of the following popes: John XXII., Innocent IV., Benedict XII., Alexander IV., Martin IV., and Clement IV.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Halphen, *Études Critiques sur l'Histoire de Charlemagne, V. La Conquête de la Saxe* (*Revue Historique*, March); Ch.-V. Langlois, *Travaux de Ch.-H. Haskins sur la Littérature Scientifique en Latin du XII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (*Journal des Savants*, March-April); E. Emerton, *The First European Congress* [the Council of Constance] (*Harvard Theological Review*, July).

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The final issue for 1918 of the *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* was an extraordinary number devoted entirely to articles appropriate to the quatercentenary of the Reformation. The contributions are arranged in five groups: the Reformation in Germany, France, and England, the Protestant origins of democracy, and the Reformation and the modern world. Leading scholars from France and other countries are the contributors.

A series of articles in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* by Professor Wilhelm Oechsli were collected and published under the title *England und die Schweiz* just before the sudden death of the distinguished author. The narrative begins in 1514, the year the first English ambassador was sent to Switzerland. The close relations between the two countries are studied in the period of the Reformation, in the War of the Spanish Succession, in the Napoleonic Wars, at the time of the Sonderbund, and in the Neuchâtel question. No similar account of Anglo-Swiss relations existed before Professor Oechsli's work, which gathers up the results of the detailed studies over the whole period and contributes much that is the fruit of his own researches.

In a Leiden dissertation, *Du Plessis-Mornay* (Kampen, J. H. Kok, pp. vii, 143) Mr. J. Itjeshorst studies in a competent manner the period of Mornay's sojourn in England and the Netherlands, 1576-1582.

The publication of the *Efterladte Papirer fra den Revenilowske Familiekreds i Tidsrumet 1770-1827* by Louis Bobé has reached the eighth volume (Copenhagen, Lehmann and Stage, 1917, pp. 594).

Sir Francis Piggott and G. W. T. Omond have edited for the London University Press a *Documentary History of the Armed Neutralities of 1780 and 1800 and the War of American Independence*; the volume is one of a series on *The Law of the Sea*.

Cardinal Gasquet has published an entertaining pamphlet on *Great Britain and the Holy See, 1792-1806: a Chapter in the History of Diplomatic Relations between England and Rome* (Rome, Desclée), based upon the correspondence of Mgr. Erskine, the papal envoy who resided at the Court of St. James during the years dealt with—a period of friendly relations, when English ships needed opportunity to refit and obtain supplies in the ports of the Papal States after the fall of Toulon.

The Danish scholar Karl Schmidt has added to his studies on the Napoleonic period a volume on *De Hundrede Dage, Waterloo* (Odense, Hempel, 1917, pp. 276).

*The Rice Institute Pamphlet*, vol. V., no. 2, embodies three lectures on the Peace Conferences of the Nineteenth Century delivered at the Rice Institute in the autumn of 1917 by Professor Robert G. Caldwell.

Vicomte Georges d'Avenel has added to his valuable studies in economic history a volume on *L'Évolution des Moyens de Transport* (Paris, Flammarion, 1919, pp. 272).

M. Boyer d'Agen's *Une Dernière Amitié de Metternich d'après une Correspondance Inédite du Prince de Metternich au Cardinal Viale Prela* (Paris, Chiron, 1919) reveals many interesting views of the famous statesman on passing events and tendencies. The correspondence, begun in 1846, extended till the death of Metternich in 1859. His confidant was a Corsican who was the papal nuncio at Vienna from 1853 onward.

Fernand Engerand has followed his recent volume on the Charleroi frontier question by a volume on *Le Fer sur une Frontière: la Politique Metallurgique de l'État Allemand* (Paris, Bossard, 1919, pp. 235).

Numerous presentations of the French side of the Alsace-Lorraine question have been listed in these pages. The German side is set forth by A. Schulte in *Frankreich und das Linke Rheinufer* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1918, pp. 364) and by the collaborated volume edited by K. Strupp on *Unser Recht auf Elsass-Lothringen* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1918, pp. 228).

E. Sauerbeck has made an elaborate presentation of one of the argu-

ments in the case for Germany in *Die Grossmachtpolitik der Letzten Zehn Friedensjahre im Licht der Belgischen Diplomatie (Geschichte der Einkreisung): eine Kritische Zusammenstellung der Brüsseler Gesandtschaftsberichte mit Einleitendem und Verbindendem Text* (Basel, Finckh, 1918, pp. 201).

Professors Tucker Brooke and H. S. Canby of the department of English in Yale University have published *War Aims and Peace Ideals, Selections in Prose and Verse Illustrating the Aspiration of the Modern World* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1919, pp. xi, 264). The selections are well chosen and arranged by countries.

The Century Company expects before long to publish *The Adventures of the Fourteen Points*, by Harry Hansen, a journalist who attended the proceedings of the Peace Conference and gives an early account of its doings from its first days to the signing of the treaty.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Vicomte Georges d'Avenel, *Le Budget de la Toilettte depuis Sept Siècles*, I. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 15); Capt. H. W. Richmond, *English Strategy in the War of the Austrian Succession* (*Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, May); E. Lenient, *Hoche à l'Armée de la Moselle* (*Annales Révolutionnaires*, July–September); A. Aulard, *Hoche et la République Rhénane* (*Revue de Paris*, July 1); C. Pitollet, *Hambourg sous la Domination Napoléonienne* (*Revue des Études Napoléoniennes*, July); Paul Marmottan, *La Mission de J. de Lucchèsini à Paris en 1811*, II. (*Revue Historique*, May–June); P. Vulliaud, *La Politique Mystique de la Paix en 1815* (*Mercure de France*, May 16); A. Monti, *Il Congresso di Vienna, 1814–1815* (*Nuova Antologia*, May 1); A. Pingaud, *Un Congrès de la Paix il y a Cent Ans* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, June); W. A. Phillips, *Peace Settlements, 1815–1919* (*Edinburgh Review*, July); W. A. Dunning, *European Theories of Constitutional Government after the Congress of Vienna* (*Political Science Quarterly*, March); Roland Gray, *International Tribunals in the Light of the History of Law* (*Harvard Law Review*, May); M. Hartmann, *Die Islamisch-Fränkischen Staatsverträge (Kapitulationen)* (*Zeitschrift für Politik*, XI. 1); S. Lewinski, *Die Wirtschaftliche Entwicklung der Letzten Zwanzig Jahre (bis zum Ausbruch des Krieges)* (*Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, LXXIII. 3); A. Iswolsky, *Souvenirs de mon Ministère*, I., II. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 1, July 1).

#### THE GREAT WAR

An Austrian "Red Book", published in September, casts a flood of light on the preliminaries of the war, and especially on the conduct of the former Austro-Hungarian government in June, July, and August, 1914.

An important presentation of the military problems of the first six months of the war is *1914* (London, Constable), by Field-marshal Viscount French. Much light is thrown upon the retreat from Mons, the



disastrous battle of Le Cateau, the French offensive into Lorraine, and the fundamental unsoundness of the Allied plan, which was to meet an attack from the east instead of the north.

*Lüttich-Namur* (Oldenburg, Stalling), is one of a projected series of monographs by the German General Staff. It gives an account of the capture of Liège and Namur from the point of view of Great Headquarters, with special emphasis on the courage and resources of Ludendorff.

K. Egli has attempted a critical study of *Der Aufmarsch und die Bewegungen der Heere Frankreichs, Belgiens, und Englands auf dem Westlichen Kriegsschauplatz bis zum 23. August 1914* (Berlin, Mittler, 1918, pp. viii, 124). *Der Wall von Eisen und Feuer* (Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1918, pp. vii, 385) by G. Wegener, correspondent of the *Kölnische Zeitung*, deals, in the second volume, with the fighting in Champagne, around Verdun, and along the Somme from August, 1915, to December, 1916.

A little book by Commandant Paul Cassou, *La Vérité sur le Siège de Maubeuge* (Paris, Berger-Levrault) is published to combat a popular idea that the surrender of Maubeuge to the Germans on September 7, 1914, involved treachery.

✓ The first volume of Sir Julian Corbett's *Official Naval History of the War*, which Messrs. Longman expect to publish this autumn, explains the naval war plans and preparations for war, and the operations up to the time of the battle of the Falkland Islands.

A first-hand account of *The Battle of the Falkland Islands: Before and After* (Cassell) by Commander Harvey Spencer-Cooper, M. V. O., is accompanied by useful charts and diagrams.

Operations scarcely known to American readers are described by Olaf Wulff in a volume on *Oesterreich-Ungarns Donauflottille in den Kriegsjahren 1914-1917* (Vienna, Seidel, 1918, pp. 277).

The operations of the Nigerian Brigade in East Africa down to the wresting of this last German colony from the forces of von Lettow-Vorbeck are described in *With the Nigerians in German East Africa* (Methuen) by Capt. W. D. Downes.

*The Advance of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force, July, 1917-October, 1918*, compiled and published by the *Palestine News* in Cairo, is published by the British Stationery Office.

Hon. William G. Sharp, American ambassador to France during the war, is publishing his remembrances and observations of the period under the title *My Embassy at the Heart of the Conflict*.

✓ *Prisoners of the Great War*, by Carl P. Dennett (Houghton Mifflin), is a statement of actual conditions in German prison camps, by the

Deputy Red Cross Commissioner sent to Switzerland in charge of the feeding, clothing, and caring for American prisoners of war.

*Soldiers of the Church: the Story of what the Reformed Presbyterians (Covenanters) of North America, Canada, and the British Isles did to win the World War of 1914-1918*, is the title of a small volume by John W. Pritchard (New York, *Christian Nation*).

The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History is making plans for the collection of data on which a scientific *History of the Negro in the World War* may be prepared.

The English translation of General Ludendorff's book on the war, apparently to be entitled *Ludendorff's Own Story*, is to be published this month by Messrs. Harper and Brothers.

The English translation of the memoirs of Admiral von Tirpitz is to be published this autumn by Dodd, Mead and Company. Vol. I. is apparently composed of chapters of history, vol. II. of a diary in the form of letters of the admiral to his wife from August, 1914, onward.

At the end of July the German government at Weimar published a "White Book" containing a mass of documents relating to the period from August 13 to November 11, 1918, dealing with the peace offer of the German government and the armistice.

The pamphlet entitled *Pourquoi l'Allemagne a capitulé le 11 novembre 1918* (Paris, Lang-Blanchong, pp. 66), though anonymous, is obviously of official character and based on documents of the French Great Headquarters. It is written to dispose of the legend that the German armies on November 11, 1918, were still capable of maintaining the war and even of being victorious.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. von Kienitz, *Die Ursache des Krieges* (Preussische Jahrbücher, January); E. Daniels, *Beyens contra Beyens* (*ibid.*, May, 1916); G. Kurth, *Le Guet-apens Prussien en Belgique* (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 1); Lieutenant-Colonel Chenet, *Les Trois Batailles de Verdun et la Victoire* (Mercure de France, April 16, May 1); L. Gillet, *La Bataille des Monts de Flandre, Avril-Mai 1918* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 1); H. Bidou, *La Troisième Bataille de la Somme, Août-Septembre, 1918* (*ibid.*, July 1); J. Bédier, *Notre Infanterie, I.-III.* (*ibid.*, April 15, May 1, 15); A. Guignard, *Les Troupes Noires pendant la Guerre* (*ibid.*, June 15); C. di Villarey, *The Work of the Italian Navy in the Adriatic during the War* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, May); General de Lacroix, *L'Offensive des Armées d'Orient en Macédoine* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, April 15); Anon., *The Military Effort of the British Empire* (Round Table, June); S. P. Osztern, *Der "Heilige Krieg" nach Mohammedanischem Recht* (Ungarische Rundschau, IV. 3); G. Deschamps, *La Journée du 7 Mai à Versailles* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 1).

(See also p. 170.)

## GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

*History* expects to begin in its October number the publication of an annual list of theses and other graduate historical work produced in British universities. In the July number the naval battle of Flores, 1591, and Sir Richard Grenville's fight in the *Revenge* are critically considered by Mr. Geoffrey Callender.

At Traprain Law, on Mr. Arthur J. Balfour's estate of Whittingehame, in southeastern Scotland, recent excavations have brought to light a wonderful treasury of artistic objects in silver and other metals belonging chiefly to the fourth century. The objects are of high artistic excellence, of designs in which the Christian element predominates. At present the most plausible conjecture is that we have here the spoils of some monastery in Gaul brought to Scotland by Angle or Saxon raiders.

Nearly one half (79 pp.) of the July number of the *English Historical Review* is occupied by part I. of an outline itinerary of King Henry I., by Dr. W. Farrer, extending from 1100 to 1117.

F. J. C. Hearnshaw has edited *Select Extracts from Chronicles and Records relating to English Towns in the Middle Ages*, a recent addition to the series of *Texts for Students* published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Excerpts from Roger of Hoveden, Matthew Paris, a charter of Southampton (1341), William Fitzstephen's description of London, and similar documents are included.

Mr. Charles Henry Ashdown has prepared with great care an official *History of the Worshipful Company of Glaziers of the City of London*.

John Blacman's memoir of Henry VI., now rare, is being reprinted by the Cambridge University Press, with translation and notes by Dr. Montagu R. James, provost of Eton.

The Walpole Society has printed as its seventh volume the *Note-Book and Account-Book of Nicholas Stone* (Oxford University Press), edited by the late William L. Spiers, who composed a most careful monograph upon a figure of importance in English architectural history, master-mason under Inigo Jones, and an independent architect. The diary of Nicholas Stone, jr., printed as an appendix, presents an interesting picture of Italian travel in the seventeenth century.

A sequel to *The Beginnings of Quakerism* is *The Second Period of Quakerism*, by William C. Braithwaite, published by Messrs. Macmillan. The persecutions endured by the sect, the development of its government and discipline, and Quaker life and thought from the middle of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century form the subject-matter of the volume.

*Cheshire Classis Minutes, 1691-1745* (Chiswick Press), edited for the provincial assembly of Lancashire and Cheshire by Alexander Gor-

don, is an important contribution to the history of Presbyterianism in England.

The third and fourth volumes of Fletcher and Walker's *Historical Portraits* have been recently published by the Oxford University Press. Volume III. covers the period 1703-1800; volume IV. extends to 1840.

The Navy Records Society expects to issue in the autumn two volumes of the *Life of Admiral Sir John Leake*, edited by Mr. Geoffrey Callender. In the near future it hopes to publish further volumes of the *Descriptive Catalogue of the Naval MSS. in the Pepysian Library*, and of the *Private Papers of George, Second Earl Spencer*, as well as a volume containing the *Life and Works of Sir Henry Mainwaring*.

Messrs. Henry Holt and Company have published this autumn a small volume by Professor Harold J. Laski of Harvard University on *English Political Thought from Locke to Bentham*, the first addition made to their *Home University Library* since the war. ✓

A life of Charles Wesley by Dora M. Jones, to be published by Messrs. Skeffington, throws light not only upon its subject but also upon the life of John Wesley. ✓

The Oxford University Press has published two supplementary volumes (pp. xxvii, 288; viii, 307) of *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, edited by Dr. Paget Toynbee. Besides 259 letters, unpublished material from journals and notebooks, and correspondence addressed to Walpole are included, and additions and corrections covering the sixteen volumes of Mrs. Toynbee's edition. ✓

The Cambridge University Press purposes to publish a *History of British Foreign Policy, 1783-1919*, in three substantial volumes based on original research by various British writers and edited by Sir A. W. Ward with the assistance of Mr. G. P. Gooch. The work promises to be one of great importance. ✓

*The Diplomatic Relations of England with the Quadruple Alliance, 1815-1830*, are studied by Miss Myrna Boyce, in no. 22 of the *University of Iowa Studies* (pp. 76). ✓

The *Scottish Historical Review* for July has articles on John of Swinton, a Border Fighter of the Middle Ages, by Capt. George S. C. Swinton; on the Highland Emigration of 1770, by Miss Margaret I. Adam; and on the history of the Seaforth Highlanders in the recent war, by H. H. E. Craster; also controversial pieces by D. Hay Fleming and Lord Guthrie on the Covenanters, and the article by the latter in a preceding number of the journal.

*Surveys of Scottish History* by the late Professor P. Hume Brown (Glasgow, MacLehose; New York, Macmillan), published with an introduction by his friend Lord Haldane, preserves in permanent form a ✓

group of important contributions by this learned and cultivated scholar, in a field of which he was a master.

After a long interval since the publication of the first volume in 1839, the Scottish Stationery Office has published vol. II. of the *Acta Dominorum Concilii*, acts of the Lords of Council in civil causes from 1469 to 1501, edited by Dr. George Neilson and Mr. Henry Paton, and constituting with its learned introduction an invaluable contribution to the early history of Scottish law and procedure.

*The Stirling Merchant Gild and Life of John Cowane* (Stirling, Jamieson and Munro, pp. 367), by David B. Morris, joins under one cover a history of one Scottish merchant gild considered in relation to general gild movements and the growth of Scottish municipal institutions, and a life of an eminent seventeenth-century Scottish merchant.

In vol. XXXIV., section C, of the *Proceedings* of the Royal Irish Academy is a remarkable article by Professor Macalister on "Temair Breg: a Study of the Remains and Traditions of Tara", taking account of much new material and giving fresh consideration to the old.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. Muss-Arnolt, *Puritan Efforts and Struggles, 1550-1603; a Bio-bibliographical Study*, I. (American Journal of Theology, July); William Foster, *The Acquisition of St. Helena* (English Historical Review, July); R. R. Sedgwick, *The Inner Cabinet from 1739 to 1741* (*ibid.*); R. C. Wilson, *Norfolk House, 1746-1815* (Dublin Review, July); R. S. Rait, *Queen Victoria and France* (Quarterly Review, July); Else Kemper, *Carlyle als Imperialist* (Zeitschrift für Politik, XI. 1); Sir C. E. Callwell, *The War Office in War Time*, I.-III. (Blackwood's, January-March).

#### FRANCE

General review: R. Lévy, *Histoire Intérieure des Deux Empires* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July).

A volume for the time is *Le Relèvement de la France après les Grandes Guerres* (Paris, Éditions de la Sirène, 1919) by P. du Maroussem, who sets forth the conditions following the Hundred Years' War, the Civil Wars of Religion, the Fronde, the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, and the War of 1870-1871.

W. Heinecker has undertaken a presentation of *Die Persönlichkeit Ludwigs XIV.* (Berlin, Ebering, 1915, pp. 119). Administrative affairs naturally fill much space in C. de la Roncière's *Un Grand Ministre de la Marine, Colbert* (Paris, Plon, 1919, pp. iv, 311).

Professor L. Gueneau has recently presented as his thesis at the Sorbonne two studies of distinct value for the economic history of the ancien régime; *L'Organisation du Travail* (Industrie et Commerce)

à Nevers aux XVII<sup>e</sup> et XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècles, 1660-1790 (Paris, Hachette, 1919, pp. xv, 634), and *Les Conditions de la Vie à Nevers (Denrées, Logements, Salaires) à la Fin de l'Ancien Régime* (*ibid.*, pp. 125).

G. Giacometti has completed an exhaustive study of *Le Statuaire Jean-Antoine Houdon et son Époque, 1741-1828* (3 vols., Paris, Jouve, 1918, pp. 389, 392, 339). The second and third volumes are devoted to a catalogue of the identified portraits, busts, and other works by Houdon.

The latest fruit of the investigations of E. Sevestre in the religious history of France is *Les Idées Gallicaines et Royalistes du Haut Clergé à la Fin de l'Ancien Régime d'après la Correspondance et les Papiers Inédits de Pierre-Augustin Godart de Belboeuf, Évêque d'Avranches, 1762-1803* (Paris, Picard, 1917, pp. 296). Abbé F. Gaugain has published the first volume of an *Histoire de la Révolution dans la Mayenne* (Laval, Chailland, 1919, pp. 542).

A useful manual for investigators is *Les Sources de l'Histoire de France depuis 1789 aux Archives Nationales* (Paris, Champion, 1919) prepared by C. Schmidt.

Dr. P. Meuriot has published two brief but interesting and useful studies: *Pourquoi et Comment furent Dénommés nos Circonscriptions Départementales* (Paris, Picard, 1917, pp. 37) and *Le Recensement de l'An II*. (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918, pp. 47).

*A Dictionary of Napoleon and his Times* (London, Cassell), by Hubert Richardson, includes a chronology of the emperor's life, biographies of his family and leading contemporaries, maps, and a classified bibliography.

*Un Journal d'Ouvriers: l'Atelier, 1840-1850* (Paris, Alcan, 1919) is a chapter in the history of journalism and of the labor movement, by A. Cuvillier.

*La Justice à Paris pendant le Siège et la Commune, 1870-1871* (Paris, Marchal and Godde, 1919, pp. vi, 275) is a monograph by Jules Fabre.

*Sedan sous la Domination Allemande, 1914-1918* (Paris, Grasset, 1919) is representative of a group of narratives now appearing relative to the condition of various French towns and districts under German control during the war. This volume is by P. Stéphani.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Bémont, *La Mairie et la Jurade dans les Villes de la Guyenne Anglaise: La Réole* (*Annales du Midi*, January); H. Prentout, *Les États Provinciaux de Normandie* (*Journal des Savants*, March); E., Freiherr von Danckelman, *Die Bedeutung Saint Malos für die Entwicklung Frankreichs zur Kolonial- und Seemacht im 16. bis 19. Jahrhundert* (*Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, April, 1916); Paul Van Dyke, *Catherine de Médicis et le Duc de Nemours: une Royale Vitrioleuse* (*Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, XXXIII. 1);

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXV.—II.

A. Mater, *L'Histoire Juridique de la Révolution* (Annales Révolutionnaires, July–September); A. Mathiez, *Le Vote du Premier Maximum, Avril–Mai 1793* (*ibid.*, May); *id.*, *L'Application du Premier Maximum, Mai–Juillet 1793* (*ibid.*, July–September); Maj. T. E. Compton, *Napoleon and the Moniteur* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, May); J. Canu, *Le Régime Électoral et l'Opinion Publique en 1814–1815* (La Révolution Française, May); É. Ollivier, *Lettres d'Exil, 1870–1874* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15, July 1).

### ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

The learned Catalan antiquary, Ferrán de Sagarra, is embodying the researches of a lifetime in the folio series *Sigillografia Catalana, Inventari, Descripció, i Estudi dels Segells de Catalunya* (Barcelona, Verdaguier, 1916, vol. I., pp. xxviii, 270, plates 89). The author has collected some three thousand originals or reproductions of seals of Catalonia and Roussillon from the twelfth to the nineteenth centuries.

The study, prepared under the direction of Professor Altamira, by E. López-Aydllo of *El Obispo de Orense en la Regencia del Año 1810* (Madrid, Fortanet, 1918, pp. 341) is a contribution of first-rate importance for the political situation in Spain during the struggle against Napoleon. The volume contains a liberal proportion of documentary materials. Interest turns rather on military affairs in *El Marqués de la Romana, su Influencia en los Sucesos de la Galicia, 1808–1810* (Madrid, Imp. de la Revista Técnica de Infantería, 1917, pp. 101), by F. Pita Ezpelosin.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Boni, *Venezia e il Adriatico* (Nuova Antologia, March 1); I. del Lungo, *Il Guicciardini nella Nuova Autentica Edizione della "Storia d'Italia"* (*ibid.*); G. Mazzoni, *Il Quarantotto in Toscana* (*ibid.*, March 16).

### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

G. Gaillard has discussed what has for centuries been one of the most important fields of German interest and activity in *L'Allemagne et le Baltikum* (Paris, Chapelot, 1919, pp. 280).

The eleventh volume of W. Stein's *Hansisches Urkundenbuch* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1916, pp. xxxii, 900) covers the period 1486–1500.

G. Wolf devotes the second volume of his *Quellenkunde der Deutschen Reformationsgeschichte* to *Kirchliche Reformationsgeschichte* (Gotha, Perthes, 1916, pp. xii, 362). The first volume of P. Wernle's *Der Evangelische Glaube nach den Hauptschriften der Reformatoren* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1918, pp. vii, 321) deals with Luther. A volume on *Luther et l'Allemagne* (Paris, Gabalda, 1918, pp. xx, 287) has been published by J. Paquier.



Hans Schulz has added two small volumes on *Der Dreissigjährige Krieg* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1917, pp. 158, 155) to the series *Hauptquellen zur Neueren Geschichte* edited by Professor E. Brandenburg.

E. Ruck has utilized the Consalvi papers in the Vatican in preparing *Die Römische Kurie und die Deutsche Kirchenfrage auf dem Wiener Kongress* (Basel, Finckh, 1917, pp. 170). J. Kissling has issued the second volume of *Der Deutsche Protestantismus, 1817-1917; eine Geschichtliche Darstellung* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1918, pp. xi, 440).

R. Goldschmit has written a *Geschichte der Badischen Verfassungs-urkunde, 1818 bis 1918* (Karlsruhe, Braun, 1918, pp. 278).

The first volume of a *Bibliographie der Sächsischen Geschichte* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1918, pp. xii, 521) has been published by R. Bemmman.

*Die Oeffentliche Meinung in Sachsen, 1864-1866* (Kammenz, Krausche, 1918, pp. viii, 256) was edited by J. Hohlfeld from the papers of H. Jordant.

Volume VI. of Treitschke's *History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century*, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul, has been published by Jarrold and Allen and Unwin.

It is reported from Berlin that the diary of the Emperor Frederick III. will now be edited by Eduard Engel and published by Dickmann at Halle.

*Deutschlands Auswärtige Politik, 1888-1914*, by Count Ernst zu Reventlow (Berlin, E. S. Mittler and Son, 1916), is marked by prepossessions now well known to the public in all lands, yet is deserving of attention.

Professor Albrecht Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Count Montgelas, and Professor Walther Schücking have been commissioned by the German government to prepare for publication a collection of documentary materials relating to the origin of the war, following up the work already done in this direction by Carl Kautsky and his wife under a previous appointment.

J. Reinke has reviewed *Die Politischen Lehren des Grossen Krieges* (Berlin, Mittler, 1918, pp. 115). Lieut.-Gen. Max Schwarte has edited a volume of ten articles by competent authorities on as many phases of *Der Weltkrieg in seiner Einwirkung auf das Deutsche Volk* (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer, 1918, pp. 521). The small volume prepared by R. Berger on *Die Deutsche Sozialdemokratie im Dritten Kriegsjahr* (Munich-Gladbach, Volksvereinsverlag, 1917, pp. 131) is made up largely of excerpts from the Social Democratic press.

*Germany in the War and After* (Macmillan, pp. 101), by Professor Vernon Kellogg, well known for his work for the Belgian Relief Com-

mission, is a very small book, but has much value as a summary of observations made by a well-placed and very intelligent American upon internal conditions in Germany, mental and economic, before and after the armistice.

Mr. Edwyn Bevan's *German Social Democracy during the War*, published in this country by E. P. Dutton and Company, presents a full survey of the part played in Germany by the Social Democrats from the outbreak of the war to the fall of Chancellor Michaelis just before the armistice.

*Zur Geschichte der K.-K. Oesterreichischen Ministerien, 1861-1916* (Vienna, Prochaska, 1917, vols. I.-II., pp. xxx, 592, 504) contains the reminiscences of Alois, Freiherr von Czedik. The third volume will complete the narrative from 1904 to 1916.

J. Ruchti has attempted an account of *Die Reformaktion Oesterreich-Ungarns und Russlands in Mazedonien, 1903-1908: die Durchführung der Reformen* (Gotha, Perthes, 1918, pp. xii, 104).

In *Une Ville-Église, Genève, 1535-1907* (Paris, Perrin, 1919, 2 vols.), G. Goyau has given liberal attention to the period since Calvin, to the transition from the Calvinist régime to the present status, and to the revival of Catholicism in the city.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. H. Loeb, *Landanlage und Kirchengut im 16. Jahrhundert* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XIII. 4); J. Rovère, *Le Développement Économique de la Bavière de 1870 à 1914* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, June); F. Meda, *Giorgio von Hertling* (Nuova Antologia, March 16); E. Troeltsch, *Die Ideen von 1914* (Neue Rundschau, May, 1916); M. Fontaine, *Six Mois de Révolution en Bavière* (Mercure de France, June 1); K. Hugelmann, *Die Länderautonomie in Oesterreich* (Zeitschrift für Politik, XI. 1).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

Mr. J. H. Holwerda's *Nederland's Vroegste Geschiedenis* (Amsterdam, van Looy, 1918, pp. vii, 219, and 30 plates) is a work of great importance for the prehistoric, Hallstadt, and La Tène periods as well as for the Batavian and Roman; indeed renovates that whole history.

Professor Blok has added to his two well-known volumes on the history of Leiden; *Geschiedenis eener Hollandsche Stad*, two admirable volumes on the later history of this famous city, *Eene Hollandsche Stad onder de Republiek* and *Eene Hollandsche Stad in den Nieuwen Tijd* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1916, 1918, pp. viii, 440; x, 233, with maps).

Another important contribution to the history of Dutch cities is Mr. R. Bijlsma's *Rotterdams Welvaren, 1550-1650* (Nijhoff, 1918, pp. xxii, 203), constructed from municipal and notarial records.

Although, as already mentioned in these pages, the fourth series of the *Archives de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau*, ed. Bussemaker, and the fifth series, ed. Krämer, have both been finished, a gap between the two, for the period of eclipse of the House of Orange, 1702-1747, remained. Mr. Krämer has supplied a small supplement to the fourth series (pp. xxv, 123) embracing forty-four letters mostly of the years 1743-1747, partially filling this gap.

E. de Moreau of the Society of Jesus has prepared a history of *La Bibliothèque de l'Université de Louvain, 1636-1914* (Louvain, Fonteyn, 1918, pp. 114, 11 plates). The account of the destruction of the library is minutely detailed and is a complete exposition of German guilt.

A volume by P. Dirr deals with *Belgien als Französische Ostmark, zur Vorgeschichte des Krieges* (Berlin, Kirstein, 1917, pp. xxiii, 479).

*Le Dossier Diplomatique de la Question Belge* (Brussels, G. Van Oest, pp. 426) is a collection of official documents relative to the violation of Belgian neutrality, the German imputations against Belgian integrity, and like subjects, edited with comments by M. Fernand Van Langenhove, secretary of the "Bureau Documentaire Belge" at Havre.

Baron H. Kervyn de Lettenhove, a member of the Royal Belgian Commission of Monuments and Sites, followed the German armies from the time of their entrance into Belgium and took systematic account of the destruction and depredations committed by them on monuments and works of art in his country. The facts are set forth in *La Guerre et les Oeuvres d'Art en Belgique* (Brussels, G. Van Oest, pp. 192, with 123 illustrations of monuments, ruins, etc.).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. van Vollenhoven, *Holland's International Policy* (Political Science Quarterly, June). A. van der Kerckhove (Fidelis), *La "Libre Belgique" pendant l'Occupation Allemande: Petite Histoire d'un Journal Clandestin* (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 15).

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

*Konung och Adel, ett Bidrag till Sveriges Författningshistoria under Gustav III.* (Stockholm, Bonnier, 1917, pp. v, 128), is by F. Lagerroth.

F. Meffert has discussed the relations of *Das Zarische Russland und die Katholische Kirche* (Munich-Gladbach, Volksvereinsverlag, 1918, pp. 207).

Professor Paul N. Miliukov's *Le Mouvement Intellectuel Russe* (Paris, Bossard, 1918, pp. 439), translated from the Russian, is an important study of Aksakov, Herzen, Granovski, and other writers; in the same volume is included a detailed study of the events which brought to the throne the Empress Anne.

Gen. Nicolas de Monkevitz's account of the Russian débâcle has been made available for western readers through translation by S. Persky into French with the title *La Décomposition de l'Armée Russe* (Paris, Payot, 1919, pp. 225).

*La Vérité sur les Bolchéviki* (Paris, Rirachovski, 1919, pp. 144) is by Charles Dumas, a French socialist who was in Russia for fifteen months following November, 1917. He has relied on official Bolshevik sources to reveal bolshevism by its fruits and to contrast it with socialism. The character of Bolshevik rule has also been exposed by excerpts from its own press collected by Madame N. Wintsch-Maléef in the pamphlet, *Que font les Bolchéviki* (Lausanne, Association A. Herzen, 1919). *L'Enfer Bolchévik à Petrograd sous la Commune et la Terreur Rouge* (Paris, Perrin, 1919) is a journalistic survey by Robert Vaucher.

*Six Weeks in Russia in 1919* (Allen and Unwin), by Mr. Arthur Ransome, recounts the experiences of six weeks spent in Petrograd and Moscow, and reproduces the statements of a number of Bolshevik leaders whom the author interviewed.

Dr. E. Privat, docent in the University of Geneva, is the author of *L'Europe et l'Odyssée de la Pologne au XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1919, pp. 352), which is a history of Poland from 1815 to the time of Bismarck.

Professor C. Jireček covers the years 1371 to 1537 in the second volume of his *Geschichte der Serben* (Gotha, Perthes, 1918, pp. xvi, 288).

An English version of the *Reminiscences* of M. Take Jonesco, noticed in our last number, is to be published by Messrs. Nisbet, with an introduction by Lord Bryce. The translation will contain some additional portraits of leading personalities of the war, not included in the French *Souvenirs*.

Professor N. Basilescu of the University of Bucharest and deputy to the constituent assembly has published *La Roumanie dans la Guerre et dans la Paix* (Paris, Alcan, 1919). One volume is devoted to the war and the other to the peace problems and negotiations.

*A Vindication of Greek National Policy, 1912-1917* (London, Allen and Unwin, pp. 224) is a report of speeches delivered in the Greek chamber by Venizelos, the ministers Polites and Repoules, and other statesmen, in the great debate of August 24-26, 1917, which brought Greece out upon the side of the Allies.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Daudet, *Le Règne d'Alexandre III.: Notes et Souvenirs*, II.-III. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 15, June 15); A. Kérensky, *L'Affaire Korniloff, Réponse Nécessaire* [to Savinkoff] (*Mercur de France*, May 16); B. Savinkoff, *L'Affaire*

Korniloff, *Réplique à M. Kérensky* (*ibid.*, June 1); J. Varat, *Le Banat Roumain* (*Revue des Sciences Politiques*, April 15); B. Vosnjak, *Les Origines du Royaume des Serbes, Croates, et Slovènes* (*ibid.*); C. H. Becker, *Barthold's Studien über Kalif und Sultan* (*Der Islam*, VI. 4); W. Bein, *Die Kapitulationen, beurteilt nach Völkerrecht und Türkischem Staatsrecht* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, April, 1916); G. Deschamps, *M. Vénisélos et la Nation Grecque* (*Revue des Sciences Politiques*, June).

#### ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

*Die Franziskaner auf dem Sion, 1336-1551*, is the subtitle of the first volume of *Die Franziskaner im Heiligen Lande* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1916, pp. xvi, 224) by Father Leonard Lemmens, O. F. M., president of the Franciscan historical establishment at Quaracchi. The third, fourth, and fifth volumes of *Le Missioni dei Minori Cappuccini* (Rome, Manuzio, 1917-1919, pp. xi, 437, 454, 505) by C. da Terzorio are devoted to the missions in Asiatic Turkey.

The Clarendon Press has lately reprinted Capt. Joseph D. Cunningham's standard *History of the Sikhs*, originally published in 1849.

*De Ost-Indische Compagnie in Cambodja en Laos: Verzameling van Bescheiden van 1636 tot 1670* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1918, pp. lxxviii, 463) is a collection of materials edited by H. P. N. Muller as the thirteenth volume of the publications of the Linschoten Vereeniging.

In view of an increased interest in Siberia, it may be well to mention that M. Maurice Courant's two long articles in the *Revue Historique*, for March and May of this year, on *La Sibérie Colonie Russe jusqu'à la Construction du Transsibérien*, constitute practically a book, and a very good one, on Siberian history and the "significance of the frontier".

*A Source Book of Australian History* (Bell) by Gwendolyn H. Swinburne is composed of contemporary accounts of the discovery, exploration, and chief events in the history of Australia, down to the Gallipoli campaign.

#### AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

M. de Castries has resumed the publication of the *Sources Inédites de l'Histoire du Maroc* (Paris, Leroux) which has been interrupted for five years by his war services. Prior to the war three volumes for France and four for the Low Countries had appeared. Now three more are being published, a fifth for the Low Countries and the first ones of the English and Spanish series.

Dr. Arthur B. Keith's *The Belgian Congo and the Berlin Act* (Oxford University Press), written before the armistice and the framing of the covenant for the League of Nations, surveys the history of the Congo Independent State and of its transition to a Belgian colony, with an eye to the correction and amendment of the Berlin Act of 1885.

F. S. Caroselli is the author of *L'Africa nella Guerra e nella Pace d'Europa, 1911-19..* (Milan, Treves, 1918, pp. 402).

### AMERICA

#### GENERAL ITEMS

From February to June, 1920, with a view to the preparation of an edition of the correspondence of Andrew Jackson, Professor John S. Bassett of Smith College will be attached to the staff of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington, in the capacity of a "research associate".

Among recent accessions to the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress are an orderly book of Charles Lee, 1776; one of Nathaniel Pendleton, 1781-1782; a letter-book of the quartermaster general of the Continental army, July, 1781, to April, 1782; thirty-six miscellaneous papers of Caesar and Caesar A. Rodney; a journal of the schooner *Palladium*, Salem to St. Michael's, 1823-1824; an abstract of the journal of the brig *Ellen Maria*, on a voyage to the northwest coast of America, 1818-1820; thirty-one letters of A. J. Donelson to Andrew Jackson, 1823-1836; some 500 pages of additional Beauregard papers; and the usual inflow of transcripts from British, French, Spanish, and Mexican archives.

The Library of Congress expects to publish soon vol. IV. of its *List of Geographical Atlases*, compiled under the direction of Mr. P. L. Phillips, chief of the division of maps and charts.

*A History of the People of the United States*, by Waddy Thompson, comes from the press of D. C. Heath and Company.

The Library of Congress has published a comprehensive and useful *List of References on the Monroe Doctrine* (pp. 122), prepared under the direction of the chief bibliographer, Mr. H. H. B. Meyer, and embracing nearly a thousand books and articles.

The Macmillan Company have included in their series of *Pocket Classics* a collection of addresses and state papers edited by President John H. Finley, with the title *American Democracy from Washington to Wilson*. Dr. James Sullivan furnishes a preface and notes.

The July *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library opens with a bibliographical paper by Elbridge Colby on early American comedy.

In the June number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* Mgr. H. T. Henry examines the evidence concerning the funeral of Stephen Girard, and Rev. Thomas C. Brennan relates the Story of the Seminarians and their Relief Work during the Influenza Epidemic in 1918. The similar account of the work of the sisters is continued.

The July number of the *Journal of Negro History* has an article on the Employment of Negroes as Soldiers in the Confederate Army, by Charles H. Wesley, which much enlarges the knowledge of that subject. William L. Imes treats in excellent fashion of the Legal Status of Free Negroes and Slaves in Tennessee. The editor, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, presents a useful general account of the study of negro life and history in our schools and colleges. A strikingly interesting body of documents, fifty pages in fact, is a series of letters of negro migrants of 1916-1918, collected by Emmett J. Scott, casting much light on all phases of negro life, but especially illustrating the causes of unrest in the South.

*A History of the American Negro and his Institutions*, vol. I., edited by A. B. Caldwell, has been published in Atlanta by the A. B. Caldwell Publishing Company.

*The Armenians in America*, by M. Vartan Malcom, with an introduction by James W. Gerard and a preface by Leon Dominian, is published by the Pilgrim Press.

*American Federation of Labor: History, Encyclopedia, Reference Book*, prepared and published by authority of the 1916 and 1917 conventions, has come from the press (Washington, the Federation).

#### ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The Macmillan Company, whose publication this autumn of Dr. Justin H. Smith's *The War with Mexico, 1846-1848*, has already been mentioned in these pages, has now taken over the publication of his preliminary volume, *The Annexation of Texas*, published in 1911.

A German presentation of one element in the foreign relations of the United States is furnished by W. Drascher in *Das Vordringen der Vereinigten Staaten im Westindischen Mittelmeergebiet: eine Studie über die Entwicklung und die Methoden des Amerikanischen Imperialismus* (Hamburg, Friederichsen, 1918, pp. vii, 106).

Under the title *A Quarter-century of American Politics* Hon. Champ Clark, lately speaker of the House of Representatives, presents memoirs of that portion of American political history which has passed under his observation.

The Houghton Mifflin Company are publishing this month *An Intimate Biography of Theodore Roosevelt*, by Mr. W. R. Thayer, president of the American Historical Association, and a classmate of Colonel Roosevelt.

Rand, McNally, and Company have brought out a compilation of President Wilson's addresses in Europe, to which has been given the title *America and the League of Nations*.



## THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR

General review: R. Thurnwald, *Amerika und der Krieg: Neuere und Neueste Literatur* (Zeitschrift für Politik, XI. 1).

*The Story of the Rainbow Division*, by Raymond S. Tompkins, with an introduction by Maj.-Gen. Charles T. Menoher, is from the press of Boni and Liveright.

*A History of the Yankee Division*, by Harry A. Benwell, with appreciations by Generals J. J. Pershing and C. R. Edwards and Secretary Newton D. Baker, is brought out in Boston by the Cornhill Company.

A special aspect of the American participation in the war is illustrated by *The Story of the First Gas Regiment*, by James Thayer Addison (Houghton Mifflin); the narrative relates chiefly to Château-Thierry, St. Mihiel, and the Argonne.

The hearings, before committees of the House of Representatives, on the losses of the Thirty-fifth Division during the battle of the Argonne Forest (pp. 104), are not available through the modes by which government publications are ordinarily obtained, but the historian of the War of 1917 will wish to know of their existence in print, as well as of the hearings on trials by courts-martial.

✓ Everett T. Tomlinson, *The Story of General Pershing* (New York, Appleton, pp. xiii, 260) is a small book, written without pretensions to great military knowledge, but meets in an interesting way the natural popular desire for further details respecting the general's career.

French accounts of the participation of the United States in the Great War have been furnished by Lieutenant-Colonel Réquin in *La Course de l'Amérique à la Victoire* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1919, pp. 202), and by Lieutenant-Colonel Chambrun and Captain Marenches in *L'Armée Américaine dans le Conflit Européen* (Paris, Payot, 1919, pp. 416). The latter gives a careful detailed account not only of the fighting but also of the organization and the work behind the lines.

(See also pp. 155-157, *supra*.)

## LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

## NEW ENGLAND

Some months ago the secretary of state of New Hampshire published vols. VI. and VII. of the *Laws of New Hampshire*, including public and private acts, resolves, votes, etc., and extending from 1792 to 1811.

The April serial of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society consists, aside from the annual reports, almost entirely of a paper on Admiral Vernon Medals, 1739-1742, by Dr. Storer, who presents a catalogue of these objects.

The chief documentary material in the *Essex Institute Historical*

*Collections*, vol. LV., is a Journal of Samuel Holten, M.D., while in the Continental Congress, May, 1778, to August, 1780. There is also a continuation of the Documents relating to Marblehead, 1696-1701, while Francis B. C. Bradlee contributes Some Account of Steam Navigation in New England.

The Connecticut general assembly of 1919 appropriated \$10,000 to the state librarian for locating and marking the graves of all soldiers, sailors, and marines, of any of the American wars, buried within the limits of the state. It also established a department of war records, under the direction of the state librarian, to collect, classify, and index all available material relating to Connecticut's participation in the Great War.

The Connecticut Historical Society has received during the past year the correspondence of Colonel Samuel Colt of Hartford, 1830-1861, about 3500 letters, dealing with the manufacture of his repeating fire-arms and similar undertakings; an orderly book of Valley Forge, kept for a month in 1779 probably by a sergeant in Col. John Durkee's regiment; accounts, etc., of Capt. Israel Putnam, kept at Fort Edward in 1757; and various papers relating to Connecticut men in the War of 1812. The society has issued as vol. XVII. of its *Collections* the first of two volumes of *Correspondence and Documents during Thomas Fitch's Governorship*.

#### MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The New York State Library's *History Bulletin*, no. 12, is a monograph, by George S. Bixby, on *Peter Saily (1754-1826): a Pioneer of the Champlain Valley, with Extracts from his Diary and Letters* (pp. 94). Saily came to America in 1784, arriving in Philadelphia in May, and his diary relates something of his experiences from that time until the latter part of August. He was elected to the New York state legislature in 1803, was a member of Congress from 1805 to 1807, and from 1809 until his death was collector of the port of Plattsburg.

By a recent act of the Pennsylvania legislature the old settlement at Economy, in Beaver county, since 1824 the property of the celebrated Harmony Society, has been dedicated to public use as an historical memorial and turned over to the state historical commission to be maintained as a public park and museum.

In the July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* the selections from the correspondence of Col. Clement Biddle (principally letters of Washington and Tobias Lear to Biddle) are concluded, as is also the account, by Hon. Charles I. Landis, of the Juliana Library Company in Lancaster. The letters of Thomas Rodney, contributed by Mr. Simon Gratz, are continued. Those in this issue were written in December, 1803, and January, 1804, from Mississippi Territory, of which Rodney had been appointed one of the judges. This issue

of the *Magazine* contains also letters of Joseph Hewes, Benjamin Rush, Arthur Lee, Thomas McKean, Edward Hand, and Elias Boudinot, and of Joseph Sherwood to the New Jersey Committee of Correspondence in 1766.

The July number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* contains the addresses delivered, April 22, 1919, on the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the incorporation of Pittsburgh as a borough; also some account of Pittsburgh authors, by Professor Horace A. Thayer, and the concluding study, by Mr. George A. Cribbs, of the Frontier Policy of Pennsylvania. The Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania has received as a gift from Mr. W. T. Beatty a volume of manuscripts of Gen. George Morgan.

#### SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The Virginia State Library has brought out *A Bibliography of Virginia*, pt. III., *The Acts and the Journals of the General Assembly of the Colony, 1619-1776* (*Bulletin*, vol. XII., nos. 1, 2, pp. 71), by Earl G. Swem. The bibliography embodies all titles of the printed official documents of the colony of a legislative nature in the period covered, including those relative to the Revolutionary conventions.

In the archives section of the Virginia State Library, Mr. Morgan P. Robinson has completed nearly one-half of the 140,000 cards necessary to index the Confederate records transferred to the archives in 1918.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* continues in the April number the Preston Papers, the Letters of William Byrd, First, and the Roll of Honor of Virginians who have died in the War for Freedom.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has added 337 letters and other manuscripts to its collection of the papers of Chief Justice Walter Clark, has completed arrangements for the making of an index to *Hathaway's North Carolina Historical and Genealogical Register*, and has brought together into bound volumes an additional number of its manuscripts, including especially the papers of the conventions of 1788 and 1789.

The January number of the *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, lately received, is chiefly occupied with one of Judge H. A. M. Smith's solid and valuable articles on the historical topography of South Carolina, treating consecutively of the seats and settlements on the north side of the Ashley River from Ashley Ferry to Dorchester. With a corresponding article for the south side of the river, which is to follow, this paper fills a gap in his series of such studies. The editor, Miss Webber, presents extracts from the journal of Mrs. Gabriel Manigault, 1754-1781, and other material for genealogical and personal history.

No. 58 of the *Bulletins* of the University of South Carolina is a *Sketch of the Life and Character of Jonathan Maxcy*, first president of that institution, and previously second president of Brown University, by J. C. Hungerpillar (pp. 56).

The principal article in the March number of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* is an account, by the editor, of the Capture of the U. S. Steamer *Water Witch* in Ossabaw Sound, Georgia, June 2-3, 1864. There is also a brief article by Henry R. Goetschius entitled *Columbus, Georgia, and General Henry L. Benning*.

*Country Life in Georgia in the Days of my Youth*, is the title of a volume by Mrs. Rebecca Latimer Felton, published by the Index Printing Company of Atlanta. The volume also includes addresses delivered by Mrs. Felton before the Georgia legislature, women's organizations, etc.

#### WESTERN STATES

*Ohio Legislative History, 1913-1917: Administrations of Governors James M. Cox, 1913-1914, Frank B. Willis, 1915-1916, James M. Cox, 1917-1918*, by James K. Mercer, has been issued in Columbus by the department of state.

The *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, in the July number, reprints from the *Trump of Fame*, the first newspaper published in the Western Reserve, an extensive body of extracts relative to Ohio in the War of 1812.

*A Story of Early Toledo: Historical Facts and Incidents of the Early Days of the City and Environs*, by John H. Doyle, is published in Bowling Green, Ohio, by C. S. Van Tassel.

The June number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* contains a study, by John E. Inglehart, entitled the Coming of the English to Indiana in 1817 and their Hoosier Neighbors. There is also an account, by Harrison Cale, of the American Marines at Verdun, Château-Thierry, Bouresches, and Belleau Wood.

At the last session of the general assembly of Illinois, an appropriation of \$20,000 was made to the Illinois Historical Library for the biennial period beginning July 1, 1919, for the purpose of gathering material relating to the participation of Illinois in the War of 1917 and ultimately preparing a comprehensive historical narrative. As a result of this appropriation the board of trustees has appointed Dr. Wayne E. Stevens, recently a member of the Historical Branch of the General Staff, U. S. A., as war records secretary, with headquarters at the State House in Springfield. The State Historical Library has also assumed the responsibility of publishing a history of the Thirty-third Division, prepared by Col. Frederick L. Huidekoper, adjutant general of that division.

This was the division which included the largest proportion of Illinois men.

The principal papers in the issues for July, 1918, of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* are: Illinois, the Land of Men, a centennial address by Edgar A. Bancroft; Illinois and Randolph County, an address by William A. Meese; and Journalism in Illinois before the Thirties, by Carl R. Miller.

To the July number of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, the editor, Mr. Joseph J. Thompson, contributes no less than three of the chief articles: one on the French in Illinois, a Chapter in Illinois Finances (Oliver Pollock, Francis Vigo, and Father Gibault), and a continuation of his series of articles on the latter. Mr. Stuart Brown's article on Old Kaskaskia Days and Ways lies in the same field.

The library of the University of Michigan has arranged with the Lexington (Kentucky) Public Library to make photostatic copies of its file of the *Kentucky Gazette*, which had its beginnings in August, 1787. Seventeen institutions have subscribed for these photostatic copies.

*Sketches of Tennessee's Pioneer Baptist Preachers*, vol. I., by J. J. Burnett, D.D. (Nashville, Marshall and Bruce Company), is the result of some twenty-five years of research among church, family, and other local records, and of note-taking from oral sources of information. While the work consists primarily of character and life sketches of leaders of the denomination during a period of substantially 100 years (1775-1875), it is also characterized by the author as being incidentally a history of Baptist beginnings in Tennessee, with some account of the century of denominational effort and achievement in the state. The book has a distinct pioneer flavor. Many of these sketches were originally published in denominational periodicals.

*A History of Saginaw County, Michigan: Historical, Commercial, Biographical*, in two volumes, by James C. Mills, has been brought out in Saginaw (Seeman, Peters). There are numerous portraits and other illustrations.

The contents of the June number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* include: Cyrus Woodman: a Character Sketch, by Ellis B. Usher; the Story of Wisconsin, 1634-1848, by Louise P. Kellogg; and Early Recollections of Racine, by Appleton Morgan, LL.D. The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has obtained from Mr. Wingfield Watson of Burlington the loan of a file of the *Voree Herald* and the *Northern Islander*, papers published during a period of about four years, beginning in 1845, by J. J. Strang, who claimed to be the divinely ordained successor of Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet. Photostatic copies will be made of these papers, which, added to the numbers already possessed

by the society, will give it 162 copies of the *Voree Herald*, out of 180 issued, and 72 copies of the *Northern Islander*, out of 90 issued. Mr. Watson has also loaned to the society, for the purpose of copying, the records of the church at Voree for the years 1844 to 1849.

Among recent acquisitions by the Minnesota Historical Society are the archives of the surveyors general of logs of Minnesota for the 1st and 2nd districts, 1854-1917. The archives of the governor's office previously received have been arranged and filed, for the period from the organization of Minnesota territory in 1849 to the close of the Civil War. Of personal manuscripts the society has received a three-volume narrative of the Civil War compiled by Col. J. C. Donahower of the 2nd Minnesota Volunteers, and a series of letters of Brig.-Gen. Le Roy Upton, commander of the 9th Infantry at Château-Thierry and the 57th Brigade in the campaign north of Verdun in 1918.

In the February number of the *Minnesota History Bulletin* Professor Guy S. Ford, writing under the title *America's Fight for Public Opinion*, presents some of the most significant phases of the work of the Committee on Public Information. The *Twentieth Biennial Report* of the Minnesota Historical Society (1917-1918) is issued as a supplement to this number of the *Bulletin*. The May number contains a sketch of General William Le Duc (1823-1917), by Gideon S. Ives, and a paper by Herbert C. Varney, entitled the Birth Notices of a State.

Articles in the July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* are: an Historical Survey of the Militia in Iowa, 1838-1865, by Cyril B. Upham, and the Movement of American Settlers into Wisconsin and Minnesota, by Cardinal Goodwin.

In the July number of the *Missouri Historical Review* (Columbia) the secretary of the State Historical Society, Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker, presents the sixth of his miscellaneous articles on Missouri and the War. A veteran editor, E. W. Stephens, relates the interesting history of the *Missouri Intelligencer and Boon's Lick Advertiser*, the first American newspaper published west of St. Louis, whose centennial was celebrated last spring. George A. Mahan gives a biography of Rear-Admiral Robert E. Coontz of Hannibal. R. J. Britton continues his papers on Early Days on Grand River and the Mormon War. The October number of the review will begin a series of reprints from the excessively rare *Shelby's Expedition to Mexico* (Civil War period).

The July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* contains a study of Texas Annexation Sentiment in Mississippi, 1835-1844, by James E. Winston; the résumé of a history of the Apache in the Southwest, 1846-1886, by Bertha Blount; a brief paper upon John H. Fonda's Exploration in the Southwest (1819-1824), by Cardinal Goodwin; and a translation, by Mattie Austin Hatcher, of two papers relating to Texas

in 1820, one of them being the report of Juan Antonio Padilla on the barbarous Indians of the province of Texas, the other being instructions of the constitutional ayuntamiento of the city of San Fernando de Bexar to its provincial deputy.

Charles A. Gulick, jr., is editing the papers of Gen. Mirabeau B. Lamar, second president of the Republic of Texas, for the Texas State Library. These papers are now in that library, having been purchased from Mrs. Loretta Calder, daughter of President Lamar, some years ago.

Mr. Benjamin M. Read of Santa Fe prints and publishes a pamphlet of eighteen pages entitled *A Treatise on the Disputed Points of the History of New Mexico*.

The *Washington Historical Quarterly* for July has papers by J. A. Meyers on the half-breed fur-trader Jacques Raphael Finlay, on Reindeer in Alaska by C. L. Andrews, a continuation of Professor Meany's account of the origin of geographic names in the state, and a portion (March to September, 1849) of the journal kept at Fort Nisqually.

*The Negro Trail Blazers of California*, by Delilan L. Beasley, is described as a compilation from records in the Bancroft library at the University of California, and from diaries, papers, and conversations of California pioneers (Los Angeles, the author).

#### CANADA

The Historical Section of the Canadian General Staff has in preparation a *History of the Organization, Development, and Services of the Military and Naval Forces of Canada from the Peace of Paris in 1763, to the Present Time*. Vol. I., which has just appeared, contains two chapters, the first of which is devoted to a rapid historical survey of the Local Forces of New France from the founding of the colony to 1763; the second chapter deals with the Militia of the Province of Quebec, 1763-1765, and is accompanied by some ninety illustrative documents.

Naturally retarded by the war, the excellent *Review of Historical Publications relating to Canada*, edited by Messrs. G. M. Wrong, H. H. Langton, and W. S. Wallace, and published by the University of Toronto, now combines in one volume (vol. XXII., pp. 203) the product of two years, 1917 and 1918. It is evident that less Canadian history was published in Canada than during most periods of two years in the time preceding the war, but that the national zeal for Canadian history continues unabated. The reviews in the volume have the careful and competent quality which marked its predecessors.

The largest attempt at a prompt Canadian war history is *Canada in the Great World War*, to be written by various authorities and published in six volumes. The first (Toronto, Morang, pp. viii, 380), by Messrs.



E. J. Chambers, L. J. Burpee, T. G. Marquis, and Charles Hanbury-Williams, is devoted to the military history of Canada from 1608 to the declaration of war against Germany in 1914.

The third volume of *Canada in France* (Toronto, Hodder and Stoughton, 1918, pp. xiv, 144) is not, like its predecessors, written by Lord Beaverbrook, but by Maj. Charles G. D. Roberts. The volume deals with the period from the arrival in France of the Fourth Canadian Division, in August, 1916, to the end of the fighting on the Somme in the late autumn of that year, and is of course well written.

Volume XIX. of the *Collections* of the Nova Scotia Historical Society (Halifax, 1918, pp. xxiii, 128) contains biographies of Hon. John William Ritchie, first president of the society, and of Samuel Cunard, founder of the Cunard Line, and a valuable paper on the early post office in Nova Scotia, 1733-1867, by Mr. William Smith of the Public Archives of Canada.

Mr. E. O. S. Scholefield, archivist of British Columbia, has edited and published the *Minutes of the Council of Vancouver Island, 1851-1861* (Victoria, the King's Printer, 1918, pp. 93) and the *Minutes of the House of Assembly, 1856-1858* (*ibid.*, pp. 78), the council having been the legislative authority in the colony till 1856, and the first legislative assembly having been established then.

#### AMERICA SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The May number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* opens with an article on Factors in the Historical Evolution of Mexico, by Señor T. Esquivel Obregon, chiefly devoted to the explanation of present conditions. Dr. C. H. Haring shows the historical data to be derived from the Ledgers of the Royal Treasurers in Spanish America in the Sixteenth Century. Professor Bolton presents documents on the introduction of Iturbide's rule into California. An article by Professor Herbert I. Priestley presents a great wealth of information respecting Mexican books on the recent years of revolution.

The Hispanic Society of America has brought out through G. P. Putnam's Sons *Cubans of To-day*, edited by William Belmont Parker. The volume contains some 220 brief biographies of representative living Cubans, together with portraits of 88 of them.

In no. 25 of the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla* the leading historical matter is a *Relación Geográfica y Descripción de la Provincia de Carácas y Gobernación de Venezuela*, dating from 1585.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. E. Chapman, *Cortes and California* (Grizzly Bear, August); M. W. Jernegan, *Compulsory Education in the Southern Colonies* (School Review, June); L. M. Sears,

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXV.—12.

*Jefferson and the Law of Nations* (American Political Science Review, August); V. P. Squires, *Joel Barlow: Patriot, Democrat, and Man of Letters* (Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota, July); W. R. Thayer, *Chapters of Roosevelt's Life: the President and the Kaiser* (North American Review, July); E. Schulze, *Die Tatsächliche Grösse der Kriegslieferungen der Vereinigten Staaten* (Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft, LXXIII. 1); W. G. Leland, *Reconstruction in the United States* (Quarterly Review, July); Abbé A. Goselin, *La Constitution de 1791 et le Clergé Canadien* (Le Canada Français, May, June); F. P. Renaut, *L'Organisation Constitutionnelle du Brésil* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXIII. 1); Frederico Sommer, *Die Deutschen in São Paulo und in den Brasilianischen Mittelstaaten* (German American Annals, September–December, 1918); Alfredo Hartwig, *Die Politische Stellungnahme der Südamerikanischen Staaten im Weltkrieg* (Deutsche Rundschau, December, 1917).

## THE AMERICAN ARMY IN THE EUROPEAN CONFLICT

By LIEUTENANT-COLONEL DE CHAMBRUN and CAPTAIN DE  
MARENCHES. With frontispiece and maps.

This book, originally written in French by two French staff officers, has been put into English by Madame de Chambrun.

The authors sum up American activities in the rear and tell in detail of the organization and fighting at the front. They begin with a chapter on The Declaration of War and Universal Military Service, after which they take up among other topics: The Arrival of General Pershing in France; The First Appearance of American Contingents on the French Front; The participation of American Forces in the Spring Defensive and in the Summer Counter-Offensive of 1918; The American Army During the General Offensive, September to November, 1918; The Part Taken by American Units at the British Front; The Various American Benevolent Associations—The Red Cross, The Y. M. C. A., The Knights of Columbus, The Salvation Army, The American Library Association, The Jewish Welfare Board, The Y. W. C. A., and others, concluding with a chapter on Franco-American coöperation.

*To be published in October.*

---

## THE AMERICAN RED CROSS IN THE GREAT WAR

By HENRY P. DAVISON, Chairman of the War Council of the  
American Red Cross. Illustrated.

Here we have the official story of the Red Cross in the Great War; its organization, its aims, its accomplishments. The author takes up the work in each of the warring countries of Europe, deals with the special conditions and problems, and outlines the results of the association's labors.

No society is more popular today with service and ex-service men than the Red Cross. This book, telling in popular style of what the men and women within its ranks set out to do and did do, shows clearly the reason for the high opinion in which it is held.

(All author's royalties on this book go to the Red Cross.)

*To be published in October.*

**The Macmillan Company, Publishers, New York**

# The Biography of a Nation

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE,—its origins, its movements, its growth; the successive steps in its long attempt to transform the Declaration of Independence from a nominal ideal into an actuality; the handicaps which it has had to overcome in obliterating the distinction between *resident* and *citizen*; its long struggle, by no means yet completed, toward equality of opportunity and true economic liberty; its progress toward a higher average of intellectual attainment; its manners, its customs, its institutions; its final awakening to its tremendous responsibilities as a World Power: in Beard and Bagley's THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE we find a conception of American history as lofty as it is new.

A philosophy of history which is new to textbook-writing underlies the preparation of this history. That portion of this philosophy which is concerned with the choice of subject-matter may be epitomized as follows:

1. There are no sacred anecdotes in American history.
2. Partisan, eagle-screaming history is a thing of the past; true patriotism rests upon an intelligent estimate of the exact degree in which we have achieved national success.
3. Individuals are historically important only in so far as they are *representative*.
4. History is, as has often been claimed, valuable partly for its biographical interest; but the life of a nation rather than that of an individual challenges the biographer's highest art.
5. *Social* history does not mean *socialistic* history; on the contrary, socialism is aggravated by public indifference to social questions.

---

## The Macmillan Company

New York  
Dallas

Boston  
Atlanta

Chicago  
San Francisco

# Sound Economic Theory

is the greatest educational necessity today. On the date when this advertisement is sent to press, five out of eight columns on the front page of *The New York Times* are devoted to the present economic crisis. If we are to avert the danger of economic chaos, both now and in the future, the masses of the people must acquire an intelligent appreciation of fundamental economic laws; and their teachers must be men to whom it is safe to entrust the industrial welfare of America.

Ely and Wicker's *Elementary Principles of Economics*, Revised, is safe because it sets forth unbiased doctrine, neither radical nor reactionary. No book on economics which is written from the point of view chiefly of Labor or chiefly of Capital can help adjust the differences between the two which are today causing so much concern.

More than any other high school text on economics, this book carries with it the prestige of a thinker who has stood at the forefront of his profession for thirty years—always appreciative of the inherent difficulties involved in the problems of Distribution, yet so temperate in his conclusions that his views have had a profound effect upon many of our greatest national leaders.

It is a significant fact that this text has increased tremendously in popularity since the appearance of the revised edition in 1917. It means that America, in its perplexity, is seeking a sound explanation of economic questions.

---

## THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York  
Dallas

Boston  
Atlanta

Chicago  
San Francisco

*The Eighth Volume of James Ford Rhodes' History  
of the United States*

**History of the United States from  
Hayes to McKinley, 1877-1896**

By JAMES FORD RHODES, LL.D., Litt.D., Author of "The History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to The Final Restoration of Home Rule at the South in 1877," "Historical Essays," etc.

This volume covers Hayes' Administration, Garfield's short one, Arthur's, Cleveland's two administrations and Harrison's, a period of nineteen years. A survey is made of the Railroad Strike of 1877, the Molly Maguires, Civil Service Reform, the Chinese Question, the Southwestern Railroad Strike, the Chicago Riot of 1896, the Financial Depression after 1873 and the Panic of 1893. These may be called non-political questions, and the student cannot fail to remark how many non-partisan matters make up the history of the time. Hayes' contest with the Democrats, Cleveland's with the Senate, seem small affairs now compared with their efforts for Civil Service Reform and for sound money. The Silver Question as it appears during the nineteen years was as much sectional as partisan. Nevertheless, in devoting so much attention to the life of the people, party contests are not ignored. The Tariff Question, for example, is fully considered, and how it came to be a party question is carefully told. Thomas B. Reed's rulings as Speaker are discussed and the several party connections and presidential campaigns receive adequate attention.

*To be published October 7th.*

**The War with Mexico,  
1846-1848**

By JUSTIN H. SMITH, formerly Professor of Modern History in Dartmouth College; member of Massachusetts Historical Society, etc. Author of "The Annexation of Texas," etc.

The story of our war with Mexico is told here for the first time. No writer has ever before been through the diplomatic and military records of the two belligerents. In addition to these almost numberless documents, an immense quantity of new material contained in local archives, the archives of other countries, the vaults of historical societies, private collections, books, pamphlets and periodicals—in short substantially everything extant that bears on the subject—has been used. Needless to say, innumerable important and many astonishing facts have come to light.

*In two volumes. To be published in October.*

**The Macmillan Company**

**Publishers**

**New York**

## **The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma**

**The Heritage of HENRY ADAMS**

As with difficulty the necessary data are gathered, human conduct seems increasingly subject to universal law. This book is a record of the gathering of data in the department of human government—by three generations of America's most distinguished thinkers, whose lives cover almost the entire period of the American experiment. The result may be summed up in this remarkable conclusion: "*Vox populi non est vox dei*. As in physics, so also in mind and administration. The theory of averages leads ever to a lower level. The perfect plebiscite, the democratic ideal, is the synonym not of perfect truth but of disaster and confusion." To be published in October.

## **The Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield**

**Volumes V and VI**

By GEORGE E. BUCKLE, in succession to W. F. MONYPENNY.  
With illustrations. Cloth, 8vo. Ready shortly.

These two volumes, the first of which begins with the year 1869, describe Disraeli's career until his death. Ready Fall 1919.

## **The Arguments and Speeches of William Maxwell Evarts**

Edited, with an Introduction, by his son, SHERMAN EVARTS, of the New York Bar. In three volumes. Each with photographic frontispiece. Cloth, 8vo.

Here are brought together, among others, the more famous arguments of the late William M. Evarts in the historic cases in which he was engaged, as the Lemmon Slave Case, the Impeachment Trial of President Johnson, the Alabama Claims, etc., several of his political and patriotic speeches, including speeches prior to and during the Civil War period, his commemorative addresses and several occasional speeches of a miscellaneous character. The editor has prepared an interesting introduction—and precedes each address or argument with an explanatory note. The book makes entertaining and instructive reading and has historical value as a representative collection of the more important utterances of a great leader of the bar of the last century and an eminent American of his day and generation.

---

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**  
**PUBLISHERS** **NEW YORK**



# American Historical Association

The American Historical Association, founded in 1884, incorporated by Act of Congress in 1889, is a national organization, of large membership, for the promotion of historical studies, with its principal office in Washington. It makes its appeal through its meetings, publications, and other activities, not only to the student, writer or teacher of history, but to the librarian, the archivist, the editor, the lawyer, the man of letters, and in general to all who have any interest in history, local, national, or general. Membership in the Association is obtained through election by the executive council, upon nomination by a member, or by direct application. The annual dues are three dollars. All inquiries respecting the Association, its work, publications, prizes, meetings, membership, as well as all orders for publications, should be addressed to **Waldo G. Leland, Secretary, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.**

Especial attention is called to a prize of \$250 offered by the Association for the best unpublished essay of from ten thousand to one hundred thousand words in length on American military history which shall be submitted to the Military History Prize Committee before July 1, 1920. The conditions of competition will be sent upon request addressed to the Secretary of the Association or the Chairman of the Committee on Military History Prize, Professor Milledge L. Bonham, Jr., Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.

## PUBLICATIONS.

### I. AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW.

The **American Historical Review**, founded in 1895 and now completing its twenty-fourth volume, is the chief organ of American historical scholarship. It is published quarterly, every number containing about two hundred pages of articles, documents, reviews of books, and historical notes and news. The **American Historical Review** is supplied to all members of the American Historical Association free of charge; non-members may subscribe from the Macmillan Company, New York, at \$4.00 per year. Back numbers of the **Review** may be obtained from the Macmillan Company at \$1.00 each, or bound in volumes of four numbers each, at \$5.00 a volume. A set of the **American Historical Review** is an indispensable work of reference for any general library.

General Index to vols. I.-X., 1895-1905. Paper \$1.25; cloth, \$1.75.

General Index to vols. XI.-XX., 1905-1915. Same price. The Macmillan Company, 64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York.

### II. PRIZE ESSAYS.

The first four essays listed below are reprinted from the *Annual Reports* of the Association; the others are separate publications. All are bound in blue cloth, and the price is \$1.00 per volume, except as otherwise indicated. Members of the American Historical Association are entitled to a discount of ten per cent. on all orders amounting to five dollars or more; non-members will be allowed a discount of five per cent. on all orders amounting to ten dollars or more.

(Reprinted from *Annual Reports*)  
**Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina: a Sociological Study.** By William A. Schaper. Pp. 236. (1900)  
**Georgia and State Rights.** By Ulrich B. Phillips. Pp. 224. (1901)  
**The American Colonial Charter: a Study of its Relation to English**

- Administration, chiefly after 1688.** By Louise Phelps Kellogg. Pp. 157. Price 75 cents. (1903)
- The History of Events Resulting in Indian Consolidation West of the Mississippi River.** By Annie Heloise Abel. Pp. 218. (1906)
- (Published separately)
- The Spiritual Franciscans.** By David Saville Muzzey. Pp. 102. Price 75 cents. (1905)
- The Interdict: Its History and its Operation. With especial attention to the time of Pope Innocent III, 1198-1216.** By Edward B. Krehbiel. Pp. 184. (1907)
- "Dr. Krehbiel has done his work faithfully and . . . has furnished an invaluable compendium". (*Scottish Historical Review*)
- " . . . Excellente monographie, aussi claire que sure. . . ." (*Le Moyen Age*)
- Great Britain and the Illinois Country, 1763-1774.** By Clarence E. Carter. Pp. 223. (1908)
- "A minute and painstaking study of conditions in the settlements in a part of the Northwest country". (*American Political Science Review*)
- A History of Witchcraft in England, 1558-1718.** By Wallace Notestein. Pp. 314. (1909)
- "The essay, a capital short story of England's share in the great illusion of the witch, is excellently suited for precise reference as well as for general information. It adds Mr. Notestein's name to the honour list among the capable, diligent, and cultured students who are steadily establishing the reputation of American research in English history". (*Scottish Historical Review*)
- The Negro in Pennsylvania: Slavery—Servitude—Freedom, 1637-1861.** By Edward Raymond Turner. Pp. 314. (1910)
- "In addition to zeal for research and for the careful collation of material, Dr. Turner also possesses the power of wise selection, logical organization, and lucid and interesting presentation of his data. As the result, he has been eminently successful. . . . The work at once takes its place as the authority in this field. . . ." (*American Historical Review*)
- The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum.** By Louise Fargo Brown. Pp. 258. (1911)
- "Only praise of the highest character is to be awarded a study at once so general, so profound in its insight, and at the same time so scholarly". (*Buffalo News*)
- "For her work Miss Brown . . . is well qualified. . . . She lays us all under obligations for the light she has shed on the 'fire in the rear' which so harassed the Cromwellian rule". (*American Historical Review*)
- The Whig Party in the South.** By Arthur C. Cole. Pp. 392. (1912)
- "It is probably the best contribution to the political history of the South that has yet been made". (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*)
- Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, Secretary of State to Charles II.** By Violet Barbour. Pp. 303. (1913)
- " . . . clear and sympathetic presentation couched in a style fortunately far removed from so-called 'thesis English'. . . . Its value lies in the details added to the knowledge of the tortuous politics of the period." (*American Historical Review*)
- Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815-1915.** By Mary Wilhelmine Williams. Pp. 356. (1914)
- "It is based on a minute and painstaking study of all available English and American manuscript and printed sources. . . . Henceforth the book must necessarily be on the shelves of all well stocked libraries." (*American Journal of International Law*)
- "Easily the best historical account of the relations between Great Britain and the United States with reference to Central America." (*Political Science Quarterly*)
- The Leveller Movement.** By Theodore C. Pease. Pp. 406. (1915)
- "Admirably written study of a difficult part of English history." (*Scottish Historical Review*)
- "It is a very solid and valuable contribution . . . and much the most detailed and thorough study we have of the political theory of probably the most interesting group in a most momentous period—a task well worth doing." (*American Political Science Review*)
- Connecticut in Transition, 1775-1818.** By Richard J. Purcell. Pp. 471. (1916)
- " . . . the qualities of clearness and entertainment are among the obvious merits of this work. . . . On the whole . . . a splendid piece of research." (*Catholic World*)
- "Fortunately there comes along now a chapter of Connecticut history that is in fact the most interesting of our whole story, and that is written out as delightfully and as informingly as any of these highest authorities could have written it. . . . Every citizen of the State should read it." (*Hartford Courant*)
- See also page 736 of the July issue of the *American Historical Review*.

## **The Colonization of North America, 1492-1783**

By HERBERT E. BOLTON, Professor of American History in the University of California, and THOMAS M. MARSHALL, Assistant Professor of History in the University of Colorado.

This book brings into one account the history of European expansion in North America, from 1492 to 1783.

Although the principal emphasis of the book is upon the mainland English colonies, the viewpoint is continental, and embraces Spanish, French, Dutch, Swedish and Russian America. No other book is so comprehensive in geographical sweep. Here the entire continent, from Panama to Hudson Bay and from the Lesser Antilles to the Pacific Coast, is brought into the general current of American history.

Instructors in colonial history throughout the country will find the book an excellent text for their courses. It gives a full account of the settlement and development of the "Thirteen Original Colonies" and supplements this by a survey of the colonization of other parts of the continent.

Colonial systems and policies are presented; the evolution of governmental institutions in the mother countries, the development of government in colonies, and social and industrial forces are considered. The American Revolution and the growth of governmental institutions during the struggle have been described with greater fulness and in broader scope than in previous texts.

*To be published in October.*

---

## **The Beginnings of Pan- Americanism**

By JOSEPH B. LOCKEY.

Prior to the formation of the present League of Nations, Pan-Americanism was by far the most important experiment in international coöperation which the world had ever seen. Its foundations lie back in the revolution of the Thirteen Colonies and in the struggle for, and achievement of, freedom by the Spanish and Portuguese possessions a generation later. With the success of these movements an American international system, free from certain baneful European traditions, was made possible.

This book makes the first adequate attempt to analyze the nature of this American system, and to trace its underlying principles to their sources.

*To be published in October.*

---

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**  
**PUBLISHERS** **NEW YORK**

# THE GERMAN EMPIRE

1867-1914

## AND THE UNITY MOVEMENT

By WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON

Author of "The Evolution of Modern Germany", "Germany and the Germans", "Municipal Life and Government in Germany", etc., etc.

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I  
1806-1888

VOL. II  
1888-1914

\$5.00

The system that took a number of small, mutually jealous states, with strongly developed feelings of Nationality, and racial pride, and welded them into a great Empire with a population single mindedly devoted to the central government, is made clear in this survey of the modern political history of the German Empire. Written by a life long student of German history and government, this work is absolutely free of any conscious or unconscious twisting of historical facts. The author has written an accurate and dispassionate account of the events which led to the formation, life and final downfall of the German Empire.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### VOL. I.

The Germanic Federation  
The Frankfort National Assembly  
Bismark—The First Phase  
The Prussian Constitutional Conflict  
The Elbe Duchies and the Danish War  
The Extrusion of Austria  
The North German Confederation  
The Hohenzollern Candidature  
The War With France  
The New Empire  
Church and State  
Social Democracy  
Index

#### VOL. II.

Protection and Fiscal Reform  
Social Adjustment  
Foreign Relations—(i) France  
Foreign Relations—(ii) The Eastern Question  
The Colonial Era  
Bismark—The Last Phase  
Emperor William II. Domestic Affairs—(i) The New Course  
Emperor William II. Domestic Foreign Relations—(i) Welt-politik  
Foreign Relations—(ii) Morocco  
Foreign Relations—(iii) The Triple Entente  
Foreign Relations—(iv) The Latter Days  
Appendix A  
Appendix B  
Index

---

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

**Publishers**

**NEW YORK**



# European History

## 1789 to 1815

By LT. COL. LUCIUS H. HOLT, Professor of English and History at the United States Military Academy, and LT. COL. ALEXANDER W. CHILTON. Price \$2.75.

This History has been written in the endeavor to present the story of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic period in its proper perspective against the background of European politics. Greater stress has been laid upon general European conditions than in other short histories of the same period.

In the account of the Revolution the authors have attempted to give a fair and impartial estimate of causes and incidents, and to show the reaction of the other states of Europe against events in France. In treating of the Napoleonic period they have endeavored to keep before the reader the general European conditions as these affected and were affected by the policies of the great emperor.

A feature of interest is the careful report of the important military operations of the period. The volume contains a particularly adequate summary of these military operations, of the strategy and maneuvers by which the famous campaigns of the period were won or lost. Technical details have been avoided in order that the accounts of the campaigns may be easily understood by non-technical students.

The presentation is clear, accurate and interesting. The book is written primarily for college students, and will prove a suitable text for courses on the French Revolution and the Era of Napoleon. Those who have used the earlier work by these authors (*European History, 1862-1914*) will be glad to find the characteristic qualities of that book in the present volume.

---

**THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**  
Publishers NEW YORK